

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, May 8, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We lift up our hearts in gratitude to Thee, our Father in heaven, for the intellectual, moral, and spiritual gifts with which Thou hast endowed us. Yet we realize how great is the responsibility in their use. The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak; hence we seek Thee for light to guide, strength to sustain, and courage to do in all the relationships of life, private and public, the right as it is given us to see the right, that we may increase our talents and prove ourselves worthy of the trust reposed in us. May we realize that there are but two things worthy of a man, namely, service and character. May it be ours to serve, ours to grow after the manner of the Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order, and the gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. MANAHAN. When I filed House resolution No. 424, asking for an investigation of the grain exchanges of the Northwest, the Minneapolis Journal editorially accused me of being an interested party in a rival exchange, and questioned my motives in filing this resolution. I think my privileges have been impugned, and I desire to address the House briefly.

Mr. MANN. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. MANAHAN. About 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent, in order that there may be no question as to time, for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, when I filed House resolution 424, asking for an investigation of certain grain exchanges in the Northwest, the Minneapolis Journal questioned the sincerity of my motives. In the editorial I refer to the following statements are made:

It is doubtful if Mr. MANAHAN has been in Congress long enough to expect the House to repair his fences and build new ones by ordering a local investigation for which it can see no public reason.

But if Congress really wants to investigate the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and the Duluth Board of Trade on a serious and sound basis, there is no reason, except useless expense of money and time, why it shouldn't. These are State corporations, have been under close State supervision, and have come with clean hands out of a series of legislative investigations provoked in the same spirit by politicians.

Congress might save time and money, however, by first examining the report of the last legislative investigation instigated by Mr. MANAHAN and Mr. Loftus in behalf of the rival business in which they are interested. The motive actuating Mr. MANAHAN might well be investigated along with the organizations. An improper motive is to be feared as much in government as improper conduct in any other relation.

Mr. Speaker, my motive in urging an investigation of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce appears clearly in the resolution itself. That organization is an intolerable monopoly. It has controlled prices and robbed the farmers of the Northwest for many years. My purpose was and still is to destroy that monopoly. But, says the Journal, I do this "in behalf of a rival business" in which I am "interested." That charge is doubly false, and the writer knew it when he penned the lines. He knew that my whole public career had been one of unwavering hostility to monopoly in every form. He knew that the only "rival business" to be benefited by breaking up the grain combine was the farmers' cooperative concerns. He knew that I did not own a dollar's worth of stock in any of those cooperative concerns. He knew, of course, that these farmers looked upon me as their advocate and general counsel. They never gave me a retainer, never paid me nor promised me a fee. My connection as attorney was nominal, and so understood by everybody. My connection with these farmers as a public man, interested in protecting them from exploitation by either the grain combine or the railroads, was and is real and vital. My father was a farmer. My brothers are all farmers.

I am on their side in this fight for an honest and cooperative market. Every householder in the country is interested as well as I am. I hope I can impress it upon the aristocratic intelligence of the cultured proprietor of the Journal that I am very much "interested" in the farmers' cooperative movement for marketing their produce, and that I am very much determined to smash, if I can, the grain combine that stands in their way.

I have asked this Congress to act. I have urged action by the Department of Justice. I expect to do what I can to get the State of Minnesota to exert all the power it has to destroy the vicious grain-gambling monopoly which for years, like a festering sore, has drained the resources and sapped the strength of agriculture in the Northwest.

But, Mr. Speaker, when a publisher uses the cruel weapon of the press to strike a public man, he invites a careful scrutiny of himself. The publisher of the Journal dare not accuse me of an improper or dishonest act, but resorts to the cowardly method of striking from behind and in the dark. He insinuates what he dare not say. Posing as a saint, he tries to suggest that I am a sinner. I am, sir, somewhat of a sinner, but Phariseism is not my sin. Possibly that is the reason why the saintly Journal of Minneapolis does not like me.

My motives are questioned when I assault the Grain Trust and its gambling, and I am tempted to inquire into the motives of my critic in defending the gambling grain graft. Mr. Speaker, who is this H. V. Jones, the publisher of the Journal, who suggests that Congress should investigate my motives? Are his own motives above suspicion?

Has he any personal experience in this gambling and speculating about which he writes so glibly?

Is he in the service of selfish big business?

Does Jim Hill own his pen and his paper?

The Journal Printing Co. was capitalized at \$200,000. There were 4,000 shares of stock at \$50 per share. On August 31, 1908, H. V. Jones and his brother paid \$1,000,000 in cash for these 4,000 shares of stock. Where did they get the money, and did they pledge their pens when they got it?

Just about a year before this purchase, H. V. Jones, Hal P. Watson, and Lou Watson, doing business in New York and Minneapolis as Watson Bros. & Co., were ruined by the slump in the stock of the Hill railroads. The firm had been James J. Hill's brokers, and their statement showed that they could not pay 50 cents on the dollar. What did they pay their creditors, either before or after H. V. Jones and brother paid \$1,000,000 for the Journal? And who gave the bankrupt, while yet in mourning for his busted brokerage business, credit for one big million dollars with which to buy a paper and preach to the people like a Pharisee? Who gave the cash or the credit?

Will Mr. Jones specifically deny that it was Mr. Hill's credit that enabled him and his brother to pay \$1,000,000 for the Journal? He has stated that the deal was financed by a trust company, but he has never given the name of that company. A trust company is a wonderful thing. It is like charity, "it covereth a multitude of sins." But whoever or whatever the trust that financed the Journal, the fact remains that ever since its invisible ownership has been represented by Mr. H. V. Jones, it has posed as a great moral force and has assumed a "holier than thou" attitude on all issues that do not affect the Hill interests or disturb the easy grind of the grain graft.

To meet the vice of the invisible ownership of the press, Congress has enacted a law requiring newspapers to make certain disclosures, and I am advised that under this law Mr. Jones has made affidavits to the effect that the Journal has no bonded indebtedness and that he and his brother own the stock. Under date of October 3, 1913, the Minneapolis Journal published its statement, which was sworn to as an affidavit, in which, in compliance with the request to state the paper's "known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders holding 1 per cent or more of total amounts of bonds, mortgages, or other securities," the answer was made, "There are none."

During the same month and a few days later—October 25, 1913—Mr. Clifford, the advertising manager of the Journal, in a speech before the Advertising Men's League, of New York, is quoted in the Editor, Publisher, and Journalist, as follows:

The story of this publisher, Herschel V. Jones, epitomizes opportunity. A comparatively few years ago he came to Minneapolis from a stony farming country in New York State—Schoharie County. He went to work as a reporter on the paper he now owns. He was later assigned to market reports—not a much sought-for position on an editorial staff. But he saw in the market reporting opportunity. He put enthusiasm into it—honest enthusiasm. He became a market expert, later he became a national figure as a crop expert, so thoroughly did he do his market reporting. He founded a financial and commercial paper. Later he engaged in the grain-brokerage business; met with unfortunate reverses. He saw an opportunity to buy this paper on which he had started as a reporter. He went out and borrowed a million dollars with a stroke of the pen, because his integrity, his honesty, his ability, had been established with men of finance. Men believed in him.

And later in the same speech, Mr. Clifford said, after discussing certain kinds of advertising, which the Journal refused to take:

Because we do not believe it is right to accept it and because we do not believe it is good business to accept it, even though a good, big piece of that borrowed million is staring this publisher in the face.

Now, I ask, who holds the "good big piece of that borrowed million" that is "staring this publisher in the face"? Does James J. Hill, whose railroads' extortion of freight-rate payers, whose railroads' underpayment of laborers and officers and trainmen the Minneapolis Journal has always defended, own any part of that "good big piece of that borrowed million" that is still staring Mr. H. V. Jones in the face? Or does the grain combine of Chicago—Armour and his crowd—control the trust company which Mr. Jones says financed his million-dollar deal? Mr. Clifford, his advertising manager, says that Mr. Jones became a "national figure as a crop expert." Had he, I wonder, furnished these Chicago wheat dealers the crop estimates and advice as a market expert on which they gambled in grain in the Chicago pit? Do these grain gamblers own any part of that "good big piece of that borrowed million staring this publisher in the face"?

Does the Journal refuse "tainted advertising" to make more effective its service to the selfish and invisible owners who still hold "a good big piece of that borrowed million" staring Mr. H. V. Jones out of countenance as a journalist and poisoning the pen with a stroke of which, Mr. Clifford says, he borrowed the million?

Mr. Clifford doubtless speaks the truth when he says that Mr. Herschel V. Jones borrowed a million dollars to buy the Minneapolis Journal, and that the largest part of that million has not yet been paid. Doubtless the capital stock is pledged or put in escrow by some sort of legal device undisclosed to secure the debt. The Minneapolis Journal obviously has evaded the clear purpose of the law requiring the publication of its real ownership.

Is this dummy proprietor of an invisibly owned newspaper in a position to question the motives of any public man?

His own motives are reprehensible. He seeks to discredit me as a Member of this House. But that is only incidental. His real purpose is to divert attention from the grain monopoly with which he was associated in the past and which he knows is still robbing the producers of the Northwest. He serves as a debtor the selfish purposes of the owners in hiding of his sanctimonious sheet.

Mr. Speaker, I deliberately state these facts concerning this publisher, who by miserable insinuation regarding my motives tries to defeat the reforms I am fighting for in Minnesota. The reform of the grain markets, which he and his paper strive to defeat, is of nation-wide importance, and therefore I place these facts in the permanent records of the Nation. [Applause.]

LIEUT. FREDERICK MEARS.

Mr. HAY, Mr. CHURCH, and Mr. SHERWOOD rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] is recognized.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, will the Speaker lay before the House the joint resolution of the Senate, No. 145?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that there are several little things here of some importance that we can get out of the way before we reach the pensions. We have plenty of time for pensions.

Mr. HAY. I am not asking for pensions.

The SPEAKER. I understand; but the Chair would rather clear these little matters up now. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) authorizing the President to detail Lieut. Frederick Mears to service in connection with proposed Alaskan railroad.

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to detail and require Lieut. Frederick Mears, United States Army, to perform service in connection with the location and construction of the railroad or railroads in the Territory of Alaska provided for in act of Congress approved March 12, 1914.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I will state that there is a similar joint resolution which has been reported by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. HAY. I will.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the gentleman mind stating to the House the necessity for this joint resolution designating this Army officer for duty in Alaska in connection with the building of the railroad?

Mr. HAY. Under the law an Army officer of any rank now below that of brigadier general can not be placed on detached service. Lieut. Mears has been on detached service as chief engineer of the Panama Railroad, and under the law, unless this resolution is passed, he can not be used for the service of

taking charge of the construction of this railroad. It is very important that he shall be detailed at once if any work is to be commenced on this railroad this season.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He is in the line, is he not?

Mr. HAY. He is in the line of the Army.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Alaska railroad bill—

Mr. HAY. The Alaska railroad bill only provides for an officer of engineers. He is not an officer of engineers.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this officer to be transferred from the work in Panama to the work in Alaska because his work has been finished in Panama?

Mr. HAY. I understand this officer is now chief engineer of the Panama Railroad.

Mr. MANN. He is superintendent, is he not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. He is superintendent.

Mr. HAY. He is to be sent at once to Alaska.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he the officer or superintendent or engineer who was in charge of rebuilding the Panama Railroad?

Mr. HAY. He is.

Mr. MANN. I think not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, he was appointed superintendent of the Panama Canal Railroad.

Mr. MANN. How long since?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Some two or three years ago, I think, and had charge of the building of the relocation of the Panama line and the concrete piers at Colon; and I think it was because of his work there that he was recommended to the Secretary of the Interior by Col. Goethals.

Mr. MANN. I understood that to be the case, but I did not understand that he was superintendent.

Mr. HAY. He is to begin the survey of the railroad in Alaska.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Has the line been selected which he is to survey?

Mr. HAY. He has to go there for the purpose of locating that line.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman stated he was to survey the line. I wanted to know if a line had been determined upon preliminary to the survey.

Mr. HAY. I do not think it has.

Mr. MANN. A commission has been appointed consisting of three members, of which this gentleman is one, for the purpose of locating where the line shall be.

Mr. HAY. Where it shall be.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HAY. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is this Army officer to be given additional compensation?

Mr. HAY. He is not.

Mr. BARTON. I understand that Lieut. Mears is superintendent of the railroad at the present time, but previous to that time that he was a Cavalry officer; and I would like the gentleman to state the reason he is considered superior to a man who had worked for seven years, as did Col. Sibert.

Mr. HAY. Col. Sibert is an officer of engineers and is employed on the construction of the Panama Canal. This officer has been in charge of the Panama Canal Railway.

Mr. BARTON. Has he done any practical engineering on the railroad work?

Mr. HAY. For the last three years.

Mr. BARTON. On the Panama Railroad?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Col. Sibert, the gentleman should state, is known as a builder of dams. This man, Lieut. Mears, every time the Committee on Appropriations has visited the canal, has had charge of the party when they went over the relocated line of the railroad. My impression is he had charge of the building of the relocated line.

Mr. BARTON. The reason I asked the question is that I have heard criticisms along the line that he was a Cavalry officer and had had but little to do with engineering, and that Col. Sibert had devoted his life to it.

Mr. HAY. I take it that he displayed a good deal of aptitude in this work; otherwise he would not have been thought of for taking charge of the work in Alaska.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HAY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House resolution 262, of similar tenor, will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 5065. An act for the relief of Mirick Burgess;
S. 4373. An act to provide for a commission to codify and suggest amendments to the general mining laws; and
S. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution authorizing the President to detail Lieut. Frederick Mears to service in connection with proposed Alaskan railroad.

S. 1703. An act for the relief of George P. Chandler;
S. 5066. An act to increase the authorization for a public building at Osage City, Kans.; and

S. 4158. An act to reduce the fire limit required by the act approved March 4, 1913, in respect to the proposed Federal building at Salisbury, Md.;

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendment, bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 13770. An act to consolidate certain forest lands in the Sierra National Forest, Cal.

FOREST LANDS IN THE SIERRA NATIONAL FOREST, CAL.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 13770) to consolidate certain forest lands in the Sierra National Forest, Cal., be taken from the Speaker's table, and that the Senate amendment be concurred in by the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. CHURCH] asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 13770 be taken from the Speaker's table and the Senate amendment be concurred in. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

An act (H. R. 13770) to consolidate certain forest lands in the Sierra National Forest, Cal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for five days on account of illness in his family.

PENSIONS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up House bill 16294, reported from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16294) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. You would only read the bill for amendment, anyhow, when it is considered in this way.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment. The bill was read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 946. James M. Kirk.	H. R. 12264. Rufus Martin.
H. R. 1043. Hans P. Nielson.	H. R. 12268. John Murphy.
H. R. 1161. Mary A. Brown.	H. R. 12317. James K. Butler.
H. R. 1247. John Beazan.	H. R. 12347. Alston W. Whipple.
H. R. 1388. Charles W. Bowman.	H. R. 12524. Mary H. Ford.
H. R. 1393. Isaiah Roberts.	H. R. 12689. Lovina M. Moore.
H. R. 1395. Barney Stone.	H. R. 12706. Allen Farley.
H. R. 1398. William G. Miller.	H. R. 12709. Ichabod S. Prosser.
H. R. 1400. Ezekiel Probus.	H. R. 12733. Gilman D. Willey.
H. R. 1403. Harriet B. Gros.	H. R. 12858. Thomas J. Clack.
H. R. 1549. Sarah M. Mitchell.	H. R. 12908. John G. Purington.
H. R. 2032. Lawson Drals.	H. R. 12977. James E. Smith.
H. R. 2393. John R. Stumpf.	H. R. 13018. George A. Orebaugh.
H. R. 2395. Samuel E. Bish.	H. R. 13049. Edwin S. Palmer.
H. R. 3147. James Crawford.	H. R. 13054. William G. Reppy.
H. R. 3154. Jeremiah R. Thornton.	H. R. 13073. Henry Tomer.
H. R. 3181. William H. Castleberry.	H. R. 13204. Cephas S. Stover.
H. R. 3501. Dora Evaline Brown.	H. R. 13214. Albert H. Shears.
H. R. 3504. George M. Anderson.	H. R. 13242. James A. Hillhouse.
H. R. 4366. Sarah Haught.	H. R. 13246. Thomas Nixon.
H. R. 4561. John Herr.	H. R. 13264. John Breeding.
H. R. 4784. Simon E. De Wolfe.	H. R. 13290. Lewis C. Lawrence.
H. R. 4824. John H. Norman.	H. R. 13291. Louis Champagne, alias Louis Champion.
H. R. 4945. Harvey G. Van Horn.	H. R. 13341. Marion N. Purdy.
H. R. 5032. Julia A. L. Brown.	H. R. 13398. Wilhelmina Wilser.
H. R. 5036. Augustus A. Palmer.	H. R. 13428. Caroline Junker.
H. R. 5280. Catharine Kistler.	H. R. 13469. Matthew S. Kinsbern.
H. R. 5324. James M. Vansant.	H. R. 13515. Suard D. Oskins.
H. R. 5342. Henry C. Yates.	H. R. 13516. Richard Riggs.
H. R. 5504. Esther McKean.	H. R. 13527. Similde E. Forbes.
H. R. 5509. Annie Green.	H. R. 13564. John M. Tyree.
H. R. 5513. Andrew Polston.	H. R. 13567. John P. Tomlinson.
H. R. 6043. Lewis Kitchin.	H. R. 13568. Henry Mooncymham.
H. R. 6259. Flora May Baker.	H. R. 13582. Tillie Bucklin.
H. R. 6264. David S. Downey.	H. R. 13588. Samuel W. Roney.
H. R. 6912. David M. Murray.	H. R. 13597. John K. Caldwell.
H. R. 7045. Katharina Brunn.	H. R. 13625. Martha Ayres.
H. R. 7246. Charles Beckmann.	H. R. 13647. Jereasy E. Odell.
H. R. 7306. Lorenzo D. Crawley.	H. R. 13657. Jeremiah M. McPherson.
H. R. 7368. Augusta S. Roske.	
H. R. 7782. Erastus L. Gilbert.	
H. R. 7989. Alfred Richards.	
H. R. 8025. Rufus M. Patterson.	H. R. 13691. Alwilda Wheeler.
H. R. 8104. William T. Beckett.	H. R. 13750. George W. Oakley.
H. R. 8110. Mary Dougherty.	H. R. 13753. William Marshall.
H. R. 8137. Jane H. Johnson.	H. R. 13823. Eva G. Klug.
H. R. 8154. John Finch.	H. R. 13839. John Winemiller.
H. R. 8177. Virinda J. Long.	H. R. 13887. Peter B. Daughters.
H. R. 8270. William Stevenson.	H. R. 13895. George W. Brown.
H. R. 8396. John L. Johnson.	H. R. 13909. James Rauh (insane); Helen Rauh, guardian.
H. R. 8440. David B. Dromgold.	
H. R. 8492. America Pippin.	H. R. 13917. Alfred T. Wilson.
H. R. 8621. Richard T. Turner.	H. R. 13935. Joanna Elder.
H. R. 8626. Daniel Bales.	H. R. 13959. Julius Kramer, alias Joseph Miller.
H. R. 8792. William Jones.	
H. R. 8794. William D. Henderson.	H. R. 13987. Simon Schweigert.
H. R. 8873. Emeline Collins.	H. R. 14028. Amantes Ruth.
H. R. 8944. Granville Deems.	H. R. 14032. William Varian.
H. R. 9082. Hugh B. Neal.	H. R. 14059. Ellie A. Hill.
H. R. 9096. Ellie Jacobs.	H. R. 14060. Arminia Shinn.
H. R. 9151. Robert N. Varley.	H. R. 14074. William H. Williams.
H. R. 9172. Edgar Van Horn.	H. R. 14087. Mollie Thomason.
H. R. 9259. Jacob B. Deardorff.	H. R. 14108. John A. Hall.
H. R. 9337. Millie V. Bennett.	H. R. 14122. Levi S. Tanquary.
H. R. 9354. Orrel Brown.	H. R. 14127. Lydia E. Davis.
H. R. 9381. James N. Dikeman.	H. R. 14132. Oliver C. Howard.
H. R. 9386. Mary Duggan.	H. R. 14137. James Roberts.
H. R. 9396. Mary A. Elson.	H. R. 14138. Cathrine E. Valentine.
H. R. 9548. Mary A. Missner.	H. R. 14147. Sarah E. Irwin.
H. R. 9808. Henry B. Norton.	H. R. 14160. Malinda Logsdon.
H. R. 9863. Lewis Minix.	H. R. 14203. Augusta H. Wilson.
H. R. 9951. Joseph Johnson.	H. R. 14215. Carrie M. Peters.
H. R. 9955. Olive E. Crocker.	H. R. 14218. Alexander Elcock.
H. R. 10044. John Lacey.	H. R. 14245. Peter W. Frederick.
H. R. 10124. James T. McCartney.	H. R. 14280. William A. Boyle.
H. R. 10220. Lucy A. Smith.	H. R. 14281. Owen E. Everhart.
H. R. 10225. Anita Stone.	H. R. 14297. Agnes Mann and Mary Mann.
H. R. 10408. Thomas F. Dotson.	
H. R. 10704. Bernard Daffner.	H. R. 14315. William H. Young.
H. R. 10707. Isaac N. Storm.	H. R. 14343. Isalah Albert.
H. R. 10712. Mary E. Greiner.	H. R. 14355. Frank S. Cashion.
H. R. 10888. Nicholas Brady.	H. R. 14403. Regina Arentsen.
H. R. 10892. Alice Clapper.	H. R. 14418. Hannah Phillips.
H. R. 10976. Susanna Reitz.	H. R. 14429. Darius Spittler (insane).
H. R. 11044. Jennie L. Tallman, now Parker.	
H. R. 11116. Zelotes B. Partridge.	H. R. 14508. Sarah A. Slatten.
H. R. 11150. Francis S. Altman.	H. R. 14526. Ann Buchanan.
H. R. 11164. David Tanyer.	H. R. 14560. Henry C. Wolfe.
H. R. 11186. George T. Kennamer.	H. R. 14574. Jacob Witmer.
H. R. 11259. Joseph S. Wiley.	H. R. 14587. James K. Barkalow.
H. R. 11388. Mary A. June.	H. R. 14590. Frederick M. Halbritter.
H. R. 11369. Lyman Rutherford.	
H. R. 11372. Michael Sheehy.	H. R. 14593. Warren L. Lovell.
H. R. 11428. Mary J. Neary.	H. R. 14597. Benjamin S. Lunt.
H. R. 11447. David Bowen.	H. R. 14602. William H. Phelps.
H. R. 11471. Nabbie E. Ward.	H. R. 14606. Etta F. Pickens.
H. R. 11489. James Hldrith.	H. R. 14634. Frances M. Dumenil.
H. R. 11549. John C. Denbo.	H. R. 14636. Eli Mundorf.
H. R. 11630. Michael H. W. Jameson.	H. R. 14637. Arthur Watson.
H. R. 11668. William McCracken.	H. R. 14638. William H. Wilson.
H. R. 11773. John N. Gill.	H. R. 14648. Mary Jane Kinsey.
H. R. 11788. James T. McIntosh.	H. R. 14654. Jay Smith.
H. R. 11851. Martin Van Hughes.	H. R. 14754. Jacob Miller.
H. R. 11946. Cyrus T. Bowman.	H. R. 14773. Samuel Stalter.
H. R. 11960. Annie M. Maratta.	H. R. 14781. James P. Walters.
H. R. 12021. Mary A. Bishop.	H. R. 14782. Morton B. Pitts.
H. R. 12040. James T. Lott.	

H. R. 14813. Phebe Ann Walls, now Pruitt.
 H. R. 14851. Mary A. Robinson.
 H. R. 14855. Daniel Miller.
 H. R. 14873. Caroline Blom.
 H. R. 14886. Roxiana Wells.
 H. R. 14900. Eva Lochner.
 H. R. 14914. James C. Wiedeman.
 H. R. 15001. Henry C. Palmer.
 H. R. 15029. James H. Tyree.
 H. R. 15031. James Ferguson.
 H. R. 15040. Clara Jane Priest.
 H. R. 15066. Edward Welling.
 H. R. 15084. Robert R. Moore.
 H. R. 15085. Joseph M. Bratton.
 H. R. 15094. Rebecca H. French.
 H. R. 15099. John Fisher.
 H. R. 15136. George Ellars.
 H. R. 15138. Phineas L. Packard.
 H. R. 15170. Mancil V. Root.
 H. R. 15178. Fannie M. O'Linn.
 H. R. 15189. John McDonough.
 H. R. 15212. Edward T. Curtis.
 H. R. 15228. Russell Davis.
 H. R. 15272. William D. Moores.
 H. R. 15294. Francis Gaines.
 H. R. 15302. William A. Akins.
 H. R. 15314. Sarah H. Dean.
 H. R. 15328. Charles Folist.
 H. R. 15338. Isalah Upson.
 H. R. 15340. Delia Keenan.
 H. R. 15345. Hermanis L. Holmes.
 H. R. 15371. Albert G. Daugherty.
 H. R. 15372. Hosea G. Messersmith.
 H. R. 15408. Sarah E. Vaughn.
 H. R. 15421. Joshua Foulk.
 H. R. 15423. Charles T. Owens.
 H. R. 15424. Thomas M. Barton.
 H. R. 15425. Mary A. Gorman.
 H. R. 15427. James Quigley.
 H. R. 15429. Joseph D. Heston.
 H. R. 15445. Jerome Stoll.
 H. R. 15448. Paphiras B. Keys.
 H. R. 15492. Augustus P. Hallenbac.
 H. R. 15518. Ann Eliza Partch.
 H. R. 15521. George W. Carr.
 H. R. 15531. Daniel L. Ordway.
 H. R. 15559. Lorenzo English.
 H. R. 15560. Martina Neuhaus.
 H. R. 15570. Harriet E. Hall.
 H. R. 15583. Martha E. Stone.
 H. R. 15591. Henry Brandenburgh.
 H. R. 15595. James W. Jamison.
 H. R. 15617. Clarinda Shipton.
 H. R. 15619. Emma Gilbert.
 H. R. 15620. Charlotte Mahaney.
 H. R. 15621. Orange S. Church.
 H. R. 15640. Nancy E. Rowland.
 H. R. 15641. Marcus L. Farlow.
 H. R. 15643. John Lesley.
 H. R. 15664. Michael Pierstine.
 H. R. 15674. Frank Blinney.
 H. R. 15717. William Hodgkiss.
 H. R. 15724. Andrew J. Jenney.
 H. R. 15738. Benjamin F. Monticue.
 H. R. 15774. Catherine A. Wood.
 H. R. 15775. Henry Bowman.
 H. R. 15776. Lucien Harbaugh.
 H. R. 15785. Barnett T. Dillahay.
 H. R. 15794. Samuel Wesley.
 H. R. 15796. Rhoda O. Raynor.
 H. R. 15820. James H. Mason.
 H. R. 15821. George T. Murray.
 H. R. 15832. George W. Roush.
 H. R. 15844. William Otha White.
 H. R. 15848. Peter Schnellacker.
 H. R. 15865. William J. Denney.
 H. R. 15880. William Lloyd.
 H. R. 15881. John E. Oylor.
 H. R. 15898. Alletha Stewart.
 H. R. 15901. Sylvanis Davis.
 H. R. 15915. Horatio P. Smith.
 H. R. 15935. Charlott E. Coplan.
 H. R. 15941. Carrie Record.
 H. R. 15947. William H. McCune.
 H. R. 15952. William P. Wilson.
 H. R. 15972. Elizabeth Aschermann.
 H. R. 16104. Christina Demerath.
 H. R. 16063. Anna C. Moore.
 H. R. 16076. John Newhouse.
 H. R. 16085. George Thomas.
 H. R. 6670. Sarah J. Watson.
 H. R. 9233. Benjamin H. Gilbert.
 H. R. 10465. John L. Taylor.
 H. R. 13344. Joseph G. McNutt.
 H. R. 13335. William H. Hastings.
 H. R. 13960. Joseph N. Weaver.
 H. R. 15808. Charles Harris.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up Senate bill 4168.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

S. 4168. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Mary Hammack, widow of Andrew J. Hammack, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 2 strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Norman P. Wood, late of Company D, Forty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 7, line 1, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Mahala E. Warmoth, widow of George M. Warmoth, late assistant surgeon Forty-first Regiment, and surgeon Fifty-third Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 7, line 20, strike out "\$25" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Mary A. V. Sanger, widow of Austin T. Sanger, late of Company B, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 16 strike out lines 12 to 15, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

The Senate bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up Senate bill 4352.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

S. 4352. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Jacob A. Shrode, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 5, line 17, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Julia A. Bachus, widow of Lucius A. Bachus, late second lieutenant Company C, Twentieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 9 strike out lines 11 to 15, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of William G. Brown, late of Company G, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 16, line 1, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate bill 4552.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

S. 4552. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Abbie A. Upson, widow of Henry Upson, late chaplain, Thirteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 2, strike out lines 13 to 16, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of William Redding, late of U. S. S. *Great Western* and *Collier*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 3, line 13, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of John Marsh, late of Company B, Ninth Indiana Legion, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 6, strike out lines 7 to 9, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Daniel Sullivan, late of Company K, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 8, strike out lines 13 to 16, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Peter Prock, late of Company B, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 10, strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Austin Groninger, late of Company H, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 14, strike out lines 19 to 22, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of John Johnson, No. 2, late of the U. S. S. *Saranac*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 17, strike out lines 23 to 25, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of George W. Berry, late of Company H, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 19, line 11, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24."

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

The Senate bill, as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 16345) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Mrs. Joseph B. Milbee, widow of Joseph B. Milbee, late of Company A, Second Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12

per month and \$2 additional for each of the five minor children of the said Joseph B. Milbee until they reach the age of 16 years.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 1, strike out the words "Mrs. Joseph B." and insert in lieu thereof the words "Esther A."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 823. Camilla Chambers.	H. R. 11964. James J. Boyd.
H. R. 921. Albert C. Pringnitz.	H. R. 12233. Emma J. Schneider.
H. R. 984. Johanna F. Weand.	H. R. 12607. Jules Toffer.
H. R. 2372. Albert G. Jenkins.	H. R. 12612. Benjamin L. Tubman.
H. R. 2730. Emil G. Herman.	H. R. 12647. Emily Smith.
H. R. 2843. Archie E. Booth.	H. R. 13366. Frank B. Gorman.
H. R. 4347. Curtin Kresge.	H. R. 13751. Samuel T. Grindell.
H. R. 4574. Linda S. Anderson.	H. R. 13760. Charles H. Raymond.
H. R. 5516. James P. Johnson.	H. R. 13778. Gustave W. Koschel.
H. R. 6001. Margaret Duggan.	H. R. 14019. William H. Shipman.
H. R. 6476. William S. Kemp.	H. R. 14088. Eliza F. Greenwood.
H. R. 6875. Daniel B. W. Stocking.	H. R. 14265. George H. Duffany.
H. R. 6946. Thomas Miller.	H. R. 14269. Hulda E. Bickham.
H. R. 6949. James M. Ballard.	H. R. 14270. Mary Ann Foll.
H. R. 6977. Lawrence Dempsey.	H. R. 14718. Mary Fowler.
H. R. 8040. William C. Roderick.	H. R. 14850. Edward East.
H. R. 8136. Carrie Crane.	H. R. 15096. Rudolph B. Scheitlin.
H. R. 8220. David T. Kirby.	H. R. 15642. Young W. Cordell.
H. R. 8263. William C. Hathaway.	H. R. 15720. Eliza Leedy.
H. R. 9066. Noel M. Pursley.	H. R. 15862. Pharaoh A. Cobb.
H. R. 9128. Hester A. Milbee.	H. R. 16030. Julia A. Robinson.
H. R. 10195. Francis M. Cooper.	H. R. 16083. Mollie A. Crosswhite.
H. R. 10561. James A. Stephen.	H. R. 16117. Sophie M. Walker.
H. R. 10962. William Adamson.	H. R. 16245. Eliza Helton.
H. R. 11436. Katherine Hempen.	H. R. 16250. Anthony R. Small.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. KEY of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 4657) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Private Calendar.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Carrie H. Travis, widow of Pierce M. B. Travis, late major, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 1, strike out lines 6 to 9, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Katherine D. Augur, widow of Jacob A. Augur, late colonel Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 2, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Sarah J. Burke, widow of Daniel W. Burke, late major, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, and brigadier general, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 2, strike out lines 9 to 13, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Edward M. Stevens, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 2, strike out lines 20 to 22, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of John Cooper, late of Company C, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 3, strike out lines 10 to 13, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Zera F. Etheridge, late hospital apprentice, first class, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 3, line 20, strike out "\$30" and insert "\$12."

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Annie La T. Romeyn, widow of Henry Romeyn, late captain, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, and major, United States Army, retired, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 4, line 6, strike out "\$40" and insert "\$30."

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Robert B. Courts, late of Company D, First Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 4, strike out lines 22 to 25, inclusive.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

S. 79. Carrie H. Travis.	S. 3908. William H. Van Name.
S. 83. Katherine D. Augur.	S. 4029. Teresa Mindermann.
S. 380. Elizabeth K. Norton.	S. 4035. Kate W. Foster.
S. 534. Sarah J. Burke.	S. 4157. Robert B. Courts.
S. 743. Alfred Zemp.	S. 4171. John C. January.
S. 1007. Charles M. Baughman.	S. 4179. Eddy J. Workman.
S. 1107. Edward M. Stevens.	S. 4194. William D. Jones.
S. 1382. Lulu E. Springer.	S. 4223. Margaret R. Flynn.
S. 2460. Barbara Henderson.	S. 4239. Robert H. Cowan.
S. 2491. John Cooper.	S. 4301. Henry C. Miller.
S. 2502. James Henry Martineau.	S. 4313. Fred Mayo.
S. 2519. Zera F. Etheridge.	S. 4355. Minnie C. Fealy.
S. 3138. Harry Willis.	S. 4356. James McMahon.
S. 3407. Dallas Thurman.	S. 4379. Charlotte Perry.
S. 3859. Annie La T. Romeyn.	

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. KEY of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (S. 4260) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Private Calendar.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Augustus R. Dixon, late of Company C, First Battalion, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 3, strike out lines 4 to 6, inclusive.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Henry F. Baldwin, late first lieutenant Company A, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The following committee amendment was read, considered, and agreed to:

Page 4, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

S. 238. William Guhl.	S. 2537. William N. Russell.
S. 589. Mary E. Macklin.	S. 2566. Mary E. McAuley.
S. 1083. William Llewellyn.	S. 2827. Sarah Ann Jones.
S. 1211. Buford E. De Vall.	S. 3480. Elizabeth A. Tice.
S. 1312. Gilbert Barnett, jr.	S. 3481. Henry F. Baldwin.
S. 1566. Charles E. Stanley.	S. 3670. Gertrude M. Phares.
S. 1586. Arthur G. Bosson.	S. 3857. Michael Reynolds.
S. 2305. Henry Koehler.	S. 3896. Mary E. High.
S. 2432. Augustus R. Dixon.	S. 4010. George W. Goodman.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. KEY of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PRINTING AND BINDING FOR COMMITTEE ON ELECTION OF PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, ETC.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, which relates to printing for the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 500.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary for the use of said committee during the Sixty-third Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has not this authorization been granted before?

Mr. RUCKER. No, sir. If it had been I would not ask for it now. I had overlooked it.

Mr. MURDOCK. What printing and binding do you want done?

Mr. RUCKER. I do not know that we want any binding done; but we have had some hearings, and the committee have ordered the hearings printed. They can not have them printed without the passage of a resolution authorizing it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

PENSION APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15230) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I wish to see if we can agree on some time for general debate. I would inquire of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] if he has any suggestions to make as to the time he will need on that side of the House for general debate, to see if we can agree before we go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, at the present time I have the small amount of seven hours and a half requested on this side, including one hour for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH], who is a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BARTLETT. I recognize the propriety of giving the gentleman an hour.

Mr. DAVIS. Aside from that hour, six hours and a half are apparently the least we can do with.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that I have application on this side for about 2 hours and 40 minutes, not including any time for myself. I should say we wanted two hours and a half on this side. Can the gentleman get along with three hours on that side and give the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] one hour; that is, say, three hours for your side, three hours for this side, and an hour for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH]?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter, a bill involving an appropriation of \$169,000,000 and the final passage of the bill will not take very long. It would seem as if the gentleman ought to consent to a liberal time for general debate.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman from Minnesota understands that, as far as I am concerned, I try to be liberal in dealing with Members of the House. I do not desire to be at all illiberal.

Mr. MANN. Let me make this suggestion. I think we ought to pass this bill before we adjourn to-morrow. I doubt if we would do anything else if we passed it early in the afternoon, for to-morrow is Saturday. Why not let general debate run without limit to-day and then agree to-morrow to close debate in time to pass the bill? There are a number of gentlemen who desire to speak, and it is undoubtedly true that you could not bring up anything new with satisfaction to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. BARTLETT. I realize that what the gentleman from Illinois says is true, and I also realize that Members ought to be permitted to have some leisure on Saturday afternoon. The gentleman's suggestion is that we do not limit debate to-day, but agree to limit it to-morrow?

Mr. MANN. Not to limit it now, but do it to-morrow.

Mr. BARTLETT. Can we agree as to the control of the time?

Mr. MANN. I think so. I think the gentleman from Georgia ought to control the time on that side.

Mr. BARTLETT. Can we agree that general debate shall close to-morrow afternoon at 3 o'clock?

Mr. DAVIS. It will not take over half an hour to pass the bill.

Mr. MANN. I think to-morrow you can fix the time for closing debate without any trouble.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. I do not want to make a useless objection, but I want to appeal to the good judgment of gentlemen here. Ten or fifteen hours' debate does not mean one hour of debate on the pension bill.

Mr. DAVIS. A part of it on our side will be on the bill.

Mr. RUCKER. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are other matters of great national importance pressing for consideration in this House. It does seem strange that we must sit here hour after hour, day after day, listening to political debate at the sacrifice of public business.

Mr. MANN. I think that is hardly a fair statement.

Mr. RUCKER. Well, I mean to be fair; I do not mean to be unfair.

Mr. MANN. There are many Members of the House who have the right to be heard in debate in the House who do not interfere very much in the five-minute debate, and they ought to have an opportunity at some time to be heard on the many questions of public interest.

Mr. RUCKER. I heartily concur in that.

Mr. MANN. They ought to have an opportunity to be heard on personal, political, and other matters of public interest. The gentleman has a bill that I am as anxious should pass as he is, but I do not think it would pass to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. RUCKER. If the gentleman has the same apprehension I have, he must at least fear we will not get it passed at this session at all.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I do not think so.

Mr. RUCKER. We must pass it in time to get it to the Senate and give the Senate an opportunity to consider and pass it.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman will pardon me, the gentleman from Missouri may not have been present and heard the Speaker say yesterday that after the disposition of this pension appropriation bill the gentleman from Missouri was to have recognition.

Mr. MANN. Recognition of the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. RUCKER. He said he would recognize the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MANN. To report a rule for the consideration of the gentleman's bill.

Mr. RUCKER. Unquestionably; but as far as that bill is concerned, the gentleman from Missouri will not consume more than 15 minutes. If time is consumed, it will be by others.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman might. We can not always tell.

Mr. RUCKER. If you will let the gentleman from Missouri have his way, he will not.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that time for general debate be equally divided between the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], with the understanding that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] gets at least one hour.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to do that which I never did before in my life and which I am ashamed to do.

Mr. MANN. Then do not do it.

Mr. RUCKER. I will do it. If the time of the House is to be wasted for the purpose, possibly, of defeating other legislation, I am going to have a quorum here to transact business.

Mr. MURDOCK. And hold it here all through general debate?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is quite a job.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. RUCKER. I want to say that I do not always answer the gentleman from Kansas seriously.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I want in a way to support the gentleman from Missouri as to important business pressing for consideration by reading a telegram from the governor of Washington to myself. It is as follows:

OLYMPIA, WASH., April 30, 1914.

Hon. J. W. BRYAN, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Unless bill providing method for direct election of United States Senators is passed by Congress within a short time our State will be

under necessity of calling special session of legislature to make proper provision. Will it be possible to get early action?

ERNEST LISTER, Governor.

Now, that is the situation. A number of States will have to call a special session of the legislature unless this measure of the gentleman from Missouri is passed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has stated three different times that as soon as we get through with the pension appropriation bill he will recognize the chairman of the Committee on Rules to call up this bill, or bring in a rule providing for it, and after that is finished he will recognize the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to call up the diplomatic and consular bill.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to make this suggestion to the gentleman from Georgia and other gentlemen interested: The rule which the Committee on Rules will offer will provide for one hour's general debate. I do not believe anybody will want to extend that time. Would not the gentleman consent, under the circumstances, involving the interests of so many States, to dispose now of the Senate bill providing temporarily for the election of Senators? If that is done, I will not object to 20 hours' general debate.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is not reasonable, and I know he does not want to be unreasonable.

Mr. RUCKER. I am glad the gentleman adds the latter part of his statement.

Mr. MANN. I did not think it was necessary.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire at the present time to say anything with respect to the bill referred to by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman consent to the suggestion which I make?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; I will not consent. This bill has been on the calendar for a month, and it is an important appropriation bill and ought to be passed.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I have reference to has been on the calendar for more than a month, is a very important bill, and ought to be passed, and if it had not been for the exercise of the inalienable rights of certain gentlemen by virtue of which time has been absolutely wasted, it would have been a law to-day.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I do not consider that I have wasted any time.

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, I did not mention the gentleman. I am surprised that the gentleman thought I had reference to him.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Georgia any request to make?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I request that the time for general debate be divided equally between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and myself, one hour of the time to be allotted to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH].

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman ask for?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I have not asked for any definite time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate on the pension appropriation bill be controlled one-half by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], with the understanding that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] is to have one hour out of the time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS]. Is there objection?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is the intention of the gentleman from Georgia to provide that the hour granted to the gentleman from Illinois should come out of the time that I shall control.

Mr. BARTLETT. No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Then the request is that the time be divided equally between the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Minnesota, except that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] is to have one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that means that there is no limit fixed on general debate.

Mr. MANN. We will fix a limit to-morrow.

Mr. RUCKER. And to-morrow being Saturday, and few Members being on the floor, possibly, because nobody wants to hear some of this debate, therefore they will go on and probably fix the time to close debate some time next Saturday following.

Mr. MANN. Next Saturday is to-morrow. We will do that, and pass the bill.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, for the present I object.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I will ask the gentleman not to object. We will pass the bill to-morrow.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman mean that we will pass the bill referred to by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER]?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I have some responsibility here, and I am trying to discharge my duties. I do not intend to allow the performances of gentlemen to prevent an effort on my part to discharge my public duty.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has gone to the limit now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman that he has gone to the limit already. He has obtained the help of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I have already objected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be concluded not later than 3 o'clock to-morrow, and that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Minnesota and myself.

Mr. DAVIS. Would not the gentleman make that 4 o'clock?

Mr. BARTLETT. Very well; I will make it 4 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that general debate upon this bill shall close not later than 4 o'clock to-morrow afternoon, one-half of the time to be controlled by himself and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], one hour of the time to go to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH]. Is there objection?

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is so very persuasive that I will withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the pension appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15280) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, with Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma in the chair.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this is the annual pension appropriation bill and carries \$163,000,000. The last general pension appropriation bill carried \$180,000,000. There was a deficiency of some \$15,000,000, caused by the enactment of the bill known as the Sherwood bill on June 12, 1912. According to the report of the Commissioner of Pensions there will be required for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, \$169,000,000 for the payment of pensions. There will be required \$150,000 for the payment of fees of examining surgeons. The decrease of \$11,000,000 from the amount carried in the bill of last year is due to deaths, which number between 36,000 and 40,000 pensioners a year, or at the rate of 98 and a fraction a day. The decrease in the amount necessary for the fees of examining surgeons is due to the fact that under the service-pension bill and the age fixed for obtaining a pension or an increase in pension examining surgeons are not required to be consulted in order that a place upon the pension roll or an increase of pension may be secured. Ostensibly there will be an unexpended balance of about \$6,000,000. We have not seen fit to reappropriate that, because the Commissioner of Pensions, before the Committee on Appropriations, stated that it might be that it would run the amount required too close, and we did not care to reappropriate the amount and then have to come to Congress at the next session and ask for a deficiency.

In the matter of fees of the examining surgeons, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Interior desires a change in that method, and I will put that correspondence in the RECORD so as to show the correspondence, my reply, and while there has been no action of the committee upon it, the members of the committee who have been consulted do not feel inclined to permit the amendment to be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] desires to leave the city at an early hour, and in order to accommodate him I yield him eight minutes, and will take up the discussion of the bill later.

The correspondence referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, May 1, 1914.

HON. CHARLES L. BARTLETT,
Chairman Subcommittee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BARTLETT: I earnestly recommend that a change be made in the method of payment of examining surgeons of the Pension

Bureau for examinations made at the homes of the claimants by substituting a fixed mileage allowance instead of the present method of payment of actual traveling expenses, for reasons which will be fully stated herein.

It is suggested that an amendment be placed in the pension appropriation bill, H. R. 15280, reported by you on April 1, 1914, and now pending in the House of Representatives, by inserting on page 2, after line 11, the following:

"And hereafter the fee for each examination made at the claimant's residence shall be \$5, and in lieu of actual traveling expenses there shall be paid 20 cents per mile for the distance actually traveled each way, but not exceeding the distance by the most direct route between the surgeon's office and the claimant's home."

The present law on this subject is found in the pension appropriation act approved May 28, 1908 (Stat. L. 35, p. 419):

"And the fee for each examination at the claimant's residence, provided his residence is outside of the corporate limits of the place of the regular meeting of the examining board or of the place of residence of the surgeon making the examination, shall be \$5 in addition to the payment of the actual traveling expenses of the surgeon."

The reasons for the amendment desired are these:

As the law now stands, an examination fee of \$3 is paid to a surgeon making an examination within the corporate limits either of the place of the regular meeting of the board or of the place of residence of the surgeon making the examination, and an examination fee of \$5 is paid to the surgeon when the examination is made outside of said corporate limits.

Under this provision of the law it has been found that a surgeon sometimes travels from 16 to 20 miles to make an examination within the corporate limits and receives a fee of \$3, and in other cases he travels less than a mile to make an examination outside of said corporate limits and receives an examination fee of \$5. It would therefore seem equitable to fix a definite fee for every home examination and to allow, in addition thereto, a fixed sum for every mile of actual travel required to make the examination, to compensate the surgeon for his actual traveling expenses.

In a decision dated March 18, 1914, the Comptroller of the Treasury states that under the present law a surgeon can not lawfully be paid for the use of his own conveyance. He says: "Payment to the surgeon for the official use of his conveyance, which is not limited to expenses actually incurred by reason of such official use, is not a lawful charge against the United States."

Train schedules are often such that a surgeon in order to make the trip by railroad must be away from his practice for a full day or longer. If a fixed allowance per mile were made in lieu of "actual traveling expenses," the surgeon could travel by any means most convenient to him. Under the proposed law it would be necessary only to ascertain the total distance traveled in making the trip, and this would simplify matters in every way and enable the surgeon to save valuable time.

Under the present law the surgeons find it very difficult to render their accounts properly, as it requires the securing of subvouchers and making notes of every item of expenditure. Every item must be stated separately and the amount expended shown, for the reason that the bureau must report the amount expended for "transportation of persons," "subsistence and support of persons," "subsistence and care of animals," "miscellaneous items," etc., each amount to be reported separately.

I am aware of the growing inclination in Congress to avoid mileage allowances in lieu of actual expenses, and to substitute as far as practicable a per diem basis of payment, but the latter is wholly impracticable in the case of examining surgeons, because the home examination in nearly every case consumes less than one day, and in many cases only a few hours.

Obviously the proposed law would simplify the matter and much time would be saved in various ways. Unless the law be changed, it will probably be difficult to induce the surgeons to leave their practice to make home examinations, and it will be necessary for the bureau to depend upon surgeons who have had no familiarity with the requirements of the bureau.

Cordially,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1914.

HON. FRANKLIN K. LANE,
Secretary of the Interior.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am in receipt of your letter of the 1st instant relative to a change in the law governing the traveling expenses of examining surgeons in the Pension Bureau.

The paragraph which you suggest is pure legislation and does not contain any provisions which would make it in order on an appropriation bill by retrenching expenditures. A point of order would eliminate it from consideration, and I feel quite certain that in view of the attitude of the House, such an objection would undoubtedly be made. Under these circumstances, I believe that it is not worth while for me to offer it as an amendment. I will, however, bring it to the attention of the committee, so that they may be familiar with it.

I would suggest that you take the matter up with the Committee on Pensions of the Senate, where the rules governing the consideration of appropriation bills are not so stringent as they are in the House.

Very truly, yours,

C. L. BARTLETT.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, on yesterday the House of Representatives passed unanimously the resolution introduced by me requesting the President to call upon the Government officials and the people of the United States to display the Nation's flag on next Sunday in honor of the mothers of our country. By that act this House has officially recognized and designated the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day. [Applause.] I want to compliment and congratulate the membership of the House for this tender and loving tribute to the mothers of our country.

Within a few minutes Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, of Texas, will secure the passage of the resolution by the Senate, and before the day is done, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States will affix his signature to this Mother's Day resolution. [Applause.]

With your indulgence I desire to speak briefly about the mother, the home, and the flag. [Applause.]

The world at times has beat me back in battles I have fought,
Not always has the god, success, touched tasks in which I wrought.
Full oft has fortune dealt a blow instead of bent to bless,
And heartaches followed close upon the heels of happiness.
And often when a solemn woe or grief my heart intoned,
And often when my spirit writhed and all my nature groaned,
There stole refrain that softened pain not born of mortal tongue,
But born of memories old and sweet, the songs my mother sung.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, state government and church government derive their strength and glory from family government, and the good angel of the fireside, the queen of the American home, the American mother, is the most important and best beloved personage in all the world. [Applause.]

John Howard Payne uttered a great truth when he said, "Be it ever so humble, there's no place like home." [Applause.] The man who loves his fireside best is the Nation's best patriot.

The home man's heart turns to, though humble, 'tis fair.
'Tis yearned for the more because woman is there.

[Applause.]

Rome retained her power and prestige until she removed the emphasis from the home and the gods of the fireside fled. The South's eloquent and beloved son, Henry W. Grady, said truly, "The strength of the Republic is lodged in the homes of the people." [Applause.]

Gen. Fitzhugh Lee when asked what is the most beautiful thing in southern social life replied, "Family love in the home." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, his answer, though short, is true. The word "home" with us means more than a place to eat and a place to sleep. It is that sacred place where a woman dwells to comfort and to cheer; where husband and wife dwell together in the bonds of a loyal love, and their children are the priceless jewels of the household, where love for right principles is fostered and genuine affection is the wellspring of life. [Applause.] I care not whether it be in a cabin on the hillside or a marble mansion on the mountain top, if sobriety, love, and contentment are there all is well. [Applause.] It should be the ambition of every father and mother, of every son and daughter, to make home the happiest and most attractive place on earth. It is the duty of every man to be diligent in business, to provide well for those dependent upon him, but this alone will not constitute happiness in the home. A woman's heart hungers for more than food and shelter. It craves kind treatment, and the sweet little courtesies of life. It hungers for soul food—sympathy and love. [Applause.] Man delights to look upon the finished product of his own skill and genius. He is pleased to see all about him the evidences of material prosperity, but there is a hunger in his heart that these will not satisfy. It is that soul yearning for the soft exquisite music of a woman's voice and the tender touch of a woman's hand. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, beyond society's fashionable halls in the sacred precincts of home, there the real potency of her life is felt; there the splendor of her reign is brightest and best; there she plucks the white feather from the wing of truth and wears it in the crown of gentle modest womanhood. [Applause.]

The ideal home is the Christian home. It may not possess the costly furnishings that grace the palaces of the rich. It may not have in it the sculptor's masterpieces of marble. It boasts of things dearer far than these. It has in it the living statuary carved in God's own image—human beings voyaging toward eternity. [Applause.] The head of the family is a sacred person and the wife of that person, the mother of his children, is the noblest work of God. [Applause.]

If the time should ever come when religion is driven from the courts and capitals of the country, from all designated places of public worship, its last retreat will be the fireside, its last altar place a woman's heart, its last lovely scene a mother with an infant at her knee as she teaches him to lisp the eternal name of God. [Applause.]

The most beautiful thing this side of Heaven is the mother's love for her child. It is the only love amongst mortals that will suffer all things and endure all things. Through poverty and good fortune, through sickness and health, through life to death, it is the same beautiful, unselfish, unchangeable mother love. [Applause.]

And he who harking back to youth goes forth and nobly tries
To color life to match the light that shines from mother's eyes,
And he who with an earnest faith his after life attunes
To those old songs of honest love his mother softly croons,
Will not pride his faltering feet upon the race they've made,
But search his heart and bless the part that mother love has played.

[Applause.]

The mother service is the unheard whisper that speaks aloud in human character. The echoes of her gentle tongue have reached the highest peak and her smile has shed a radiance in the lowliest cabins of earth. [Applause.] All honor to the mothers of our country and all hail to our flag on Mother's Day. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago some of the boys in blue died for that flag at Vera Cruz. Every one of them was the son of an American mother. They were her contributions to her country and her country's flag. [Applause.] If her boys can fight and die for Old Glory in a foreign land, we can put it to no higher use nor exalt it more than to unfurl it and reconsecrate it in the homeland on Mother's Day. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, this patriotic and loving act will give further emphasis to the fact that the strength of the Republic is lodged in the homes of the people; that the hearthstone is the true altar of liberty [applause]; that "the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world." [Applause.] Then, on next Sunday—Mother's Day—let us unfurl the Stars and Stripes, and from every rooftop fly the flag of the Republic. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I will now further proceed to discuss the bill.

The Secretary of the Interior, in the letter which I shall print, has requested that the committee shall change the manner of payment of fees to examining surgeons, which involves legislation upon this bill, and which, instead of paying them fees limited to \$3 and \$5, proposes to pay them 20 cents a mile for the distance that they should have to travel in going to see the person examined—the applicant for pension. I did not feel that I could offer that amendment for two reasons: First, because it was legislation upon a general appropriation bill, and therefore subject to a point of order; and, second, because I did not feel that I could call upon the House, which has so recently and on various occasions heretofore expressed its disapproval of that manner of payment for services rendered, even by Members of Congress. And I decline to offer the amendment or recommend its adoption by the committee or the House.

Mr. Chairman, this is a large amount of money to be appropriated for any purpose. We are now nearly 50 years away from the end of the Civil War, out of which the greater amount of pensions carried in this bill grew. It will be observed upon examination of the report that the amount we have paid since 1866 for pensions is \$4,586,966,346.09. It is true that embraced in that sum are pensions which we paid up to eight years ago for the Revolutionary War, and up to last year to a pensioner of the War of 1812, and there now remain upon the pension roll 199 pensioners, widows and children of the men of the latter war. It is, Mr. Chairman, to say the least of it, rather peculiar to find myself in a position as reporting from the Appropriations Committee, as I have done heretofore since I have been a member of that committee, the bill which carries this large amount for the payment of pensions, the greater part of which are to be paid to soldiers or dependents for services rendered in the War between the States in 1861 to 1865.

It has always been the policy of the Government, demonstrated by the acts of Congress after the various wars in which we have engaged, to pay liberal pensions to those who have fought the war and to the children and the widows who may have survived them. For myself, Mr. Chairman, I do not carry in my heart any animosity, any dislike, for a real soldier of the Federal Army who fought against the Confederate forces. I am the son of a Confederate officer who gave four years of service to the war between the States upon the Confederate side. I realize it to be a fact that if the Confederate forces had succeeded there would have been no doubt liberal pensions provided for the survivors of that war. The various States composing the Southern Confederacy tax themselves very burdensomely in order to pay pensions to men who served in the Confederate Army and to their survivors. The people of Georgia willingly and cheerfully bear the burden of that taxation. I was myself a member of the legislature which provided for a constitutional amendment granting pensions to the widows of Confederate soldiers. We in the South—at least I believe that to be the sentiment—have no opposition to pensions being paid to real soldiers. It was my pleasure the other day to meet for the first time a Federal soldier who left both his legs upon a battle field in Virginia and who had to get about upon artificial limbs. He was a real soldier. I refer to the present register of wills, Corp. Tanner, whom I had never met before. I would not begrudge a dollar or vote against giving a soldier of that kind and that character a liberal pension. I think he is entitled to it and ought to have it. I would not vote against appropriating money that would pension a soldier who had re-

ceived wounds or incurred diseases or disability in the service of his country. I would not vote in the Legislature of the State of Georgia against giving pensions to Confederate soldiers who were of the one hundred and twenty and odd thousand that Georgia sent to the war. I do not believe, however, that the mere fact of a service of 60 or 90 days ought to entitle a man to a pension unless he is destitute or indigent. I do not know whether this pension roll is a roll of honor or not. I do know, from statements made and charges and evidence, that there are those upon it who were not entitled to be upon it by reason of the services that they rendered. I have nothing to say and no animosity in my heart against and nothing but admiration and love for the real soldier who bore the brunt of the fight for four years and who now receives a pension.

I resided in that locality which was swept by Sherman's march to the sea. My family and my friends suffered desolation and destruction of property and hunger and want by reason of that march. And yet I have no opposition to pensioning the real soldiers of the Federal Army who were wounded or received disabilities and who are indigent; but I do object and protest that those who were camp followers, destroyers, and plunderers, who received large bounties and then jumped them and were again enlisted in the Army, and who followed in the wake of the Army, should not by special provision or other provision be provided with a pension by this Government merely for enlisting and being on the rolls for 90 days.

The animosities of the war, so far as I am concerned and so far as my people are concerned, have died out, and this very week there is assembled in a southern city, near the sea, in Florida, the meeting of the United Confederate Veterans. And one of the things that is to be celebrated is the return of a Federal battle flag taken by a Confederate regiment or company in one of the battles, and the governor of Ohio has sent a special messenger to receive from that old Confederate company the battle flag of an Ohio regiment, to be returned to Ohio.

The real soldiers on both sides of that great struggle honor and respect each other. They march arm in arm and hand in hand when they meet together. It is only those who never smelt gunpowder except to run away from it who undertake to keep alive the animosities of the war.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLINE. I want to inquire if another fact does not evidence the dying out of any animosity, and that is the fact that the governor of Ohio has invited the Confederate veterans to hold their next reunion at the city of Columbus?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; I was going to state that. That is a fact. I know the governor of Ohio personally, and I know that that sentiment comes from his heart, and that it is representative of the governor of Ohio and the old Union veterans of Ohio who really took active part in the Civil War.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know when this great pension roll will be decreased, except by the natural decreases in the death of those now upon the roll. I would be glad if I could see some suggestion that it would be decreased. But if we will have war, if we will have foreign wars and civil wars and civil strife, we must pay for them in pension rolls. The Spanish-American War to-day has been the cause of a pension roll amounting to something like \$29,000,000. So, if we must have armies and navies, if we must fight wars, we must pay the penalty, not only in outright blood and treasure, but history shows that we must mortgage posterity as well to pay the pensions that men receive from having engaged in war or from receiving wounds or contracting diseases.

It has been the policy of the country to do that—to take care of them by pensions. I do not approve of the entire policy. I did not vote for the Sherwood bill. I did not vote for these other bills. My idea is that a pension should be based upon service, upon wounds and disease contracted, and should be given to those who are unable to make a livelihood for themselves. I do not believe that a pension should be paid to those who are not in want or in need. I do not believe that the American soldier would be less patriotic and perform his duty with less valor and heroism if he did not, as has been suggested sometimes, know that he was to receive a pension.

Mr. Chairman, there are some other things that I desire to say with reference to another matter, but I shall reserve my time, and now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND]. I yield him 45 minutes. I will resume my remarks at some time later.

The report on this bill will give full information as to this bill.

[House of Representatives, Report No. 486, Sixty-third Congress, second session.]

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following report, to accompany H. R. 15280:

The Committee on Appropriations, in presenting the bill making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions for the fiscal year 1915, submit the following in explanation thereof:

The estimates on which the bill is based will be found on page 357 of the Book of Estimates for 1915, and amount to \$169,150,000.

The accompanying bill appropriates \$169,150,000. The following statement gives, by appropriate title of expenditure, the amounts appropriated for 1914, the estimates for 1915, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1915:

Title of expenditure.	Appropriations for 1914.	Estimates for 1915.	Recommended for 1915.
Payment of pensions.....	\$180,000,000	\$169,000,000	\$169,000,000
Fees of examining surgeons.....	300,000	150,000	150,000
Total.....	180,300,000	169,150,000	169,150,000

The reduction, from \$180,000,000 for 1914 to \$169,000,000 for 1915, in the appropriation for payment of pensions is in accordance with the annual estimates submitted to Congress and is approved by the Commissioner of Pensions in statements made by him to the committee.

The reduction in the amount for payment of fees of examining surgeons in pension cases is also in accordance with the estimates and the recommendation of the Commissioner of Pensions from \$300,000 for 1914 to \$150,000 for 1915; this service is largely diminished, for the reason that many who are put on the pension roll now because of age and service are not required to submit to medical examination.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR PENSIONS.

The following table, taken from the report of the Commissioner of Pensions, shows the amounts paid by the Government in pensions to soldiers, sailors, and marines, their widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, on account of military and naval service since the foundation of the Republic:

War of the Revolution (estimated).....	\$70,000,000.00
War of 1812 (service pension).....	45,923,014.46
Indian wars (service pension).....	12,241,273.61
War with Mexico (service pension).....	47,632,572.34
Civil War.....	4,294,596,944.47
War with Spain and Philippine insurrection.....	42,185,230.84
Regular Establishment.....	28,461,369.52
Unclassified.....	16,499,419.44

Total..... 4,557,539,824.68

The following table, also compiled from the annual reports of the Commissioner of Pensions, shows the number of pensioners on the roll, the annual value of pensions, the disbursements on account of pensions, the number of original applications filed, and the number of original claims allowed each fiscal year from 1879 to 1913, inclusive:

Fiscal year.	Number of pensioners on the roll.	Annual value of pensions.	Disbursements on account of pensions.	Total number of applications filed, original.	Total number of claims allowed, original.
1879.....	242,755	\$25,493,742.15	\$33,664,428.92	57,118	31,346
1880.....	250,802	25,917,906.60	56,689,229.08	141,466	19,545
1881.....	268,830	28,769,957.46	50,583,405.35	31,116	27,394
1882.....	285,697	29,341,101.62	54,313,172.05	40,939	27,664
1883.....	303,658	32,245,192.43	60,427,573.81	48,776	38,162
1884.....	322,756	34,456,900.35	57,912,387.47	41,785	34,192
1885.....	345,125	38,990,985.28	65,171,937.12	40,918	35,767
1886.....	365,783	44,708,027.44	64,091,142.90	49,895	40,857
1887.....	406,007	52,824,641.22	73,752,997.08	72,465	55,194
1888.....	452,557	56,707,220.92	78,950,501.67	75,726	60,252
1889.....	489,725	64,246,552.36	88,842,720.58	81,220	51,921
1890.....	537,944	72,052,143.49	106,094,250.39	105,044	66,637
1891.....	676,100	89,247,200.20	117,312,690.50	696,941	156,486
1892.....	876,068	116,879,867.24	139,394,147.11	246,638	224,047
1893.....	966,012	130,510,179.34	156,906,637.94	119,361	121,630
1894.....	969,544	130,120,863.00	139,986,726.17	57,141	39,085
1895.....	970,524	130,048,365.00	139,507,788.98	45,361	39,185
1896.....	970,678	129,485,587.00	138,215,174.08	42,244	40,374
1897.....	976,014	129,795,428.00	139,949,717.35	50,585	50,101
1898.....	993,714	130,968,465.00	144,651,879.80	48,732	52,648
1899.....	991,519	131,617,961.00	138,335,052.95	53,881	37,077
1900.....	993,529	131,534,544.00	138,462,130.65	51,964	40,645
1901.....	997,735	131,568,216.00	138,531,483.84	58,373	44,898
1902.....	999,446	132,152,800.00	137,094,267.99	47,965	40,173
1903.....	996,545	133,029,030.00	137,759,653.71	52,325	40,136
1904.....	994,762	134,130,203.00	141,093,571.00	55,794	44,236
1905.....	998,441	136,745,295.00	141,142,861.33	52,841	50,027
1906.....	985,971	136,237,749.00	139,000,288.25	37,212	34,974
1907.....	967,371	140,850,880.60	138,155,412.46	43,619	29,945
1908.....	951,687	159,495,701.00	153,093,086.27	46,619	37,691
1909.....	946,194	160,682,570.32	161,978,703.50	35,789	45,086
1910.....	921,083	158,332,391.82	159,974,056.08	31,777	28,027
1911.....	892,068	154,834,237.80	157,326,160.35	30,601	25,519
1912.....	860,294	151,558,141.40	152,986,105.22	27,892	22,777
1913.....	820,200	171,490,784.52	174,171,660.80	27,856	19,346

The first payments made on new certificates each year for the past five years, with the averages, and the averages of first payments by classes during the past year are shown in the commissioner's report as follows:

First payments during the last five years.

Fiscal year.	Number.	Amount.	Average.
1913.....	433,995	\$18,250,225	\$42.05
1912.....	78,781	4,096,502	53.00
1911.....	93,632	4,842,925	51.72
1910.....	91,448	4,858,504	52.13
1909.....	124,634	6,489,416	52.07

Average first payments in each class.

Average value of first payments:	
In original cases.....	\$88.78
In original Regular Establishment cases.....	104.46
In original act May 11, 1912, cases.....	74.47
In original act Feb. 6, 1907, cases.....	192.98
In original general law, Civil War cases.....	136.45
In original act June 27, 1890, cases.....	261.20
In original act Apr. 19, 1908, cases.....	62.53
In original War with Spain cases.....	254.90
In increase and reissue cases.....	39.83
In original War with Mexico cases.....	150.03
In original Indian wars cases.....	192.54
In all cases.....	42.05

REFERENCES.

Navy pension fund: Section 4753 of the Revised Statutes provides that Navy pensions shall be paid out of the "Navy pension fund," upon an appropriation by Congress, so far as the same may be sufficient. The naval pension fund at present amounts to \$14,000,000, bearing interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, and is created under the provisions of sections 4751 and 4752 of the Revised Statutes. The payments on account of Navy pensions during the fiscal year 1913 aggregated \$0,021,684.84.

Number of pensioners in each State and Territory, each insular possession, and each foreign country on the rolls June 30, 1913, and the amounts paid therein during the fiscal year 1913.

[Report of Commissioner of Pensions, p. 27.]

State or Territory.	Number.	Amount.	Country.	Number.	Amount.
Alabama.....	3,230	\$685,825.90	INSULAR POSSESSIONS.		
Alaska.....	80	16,986.40			
Arizona.....	895	190,035.35			
Arkansas.....	8,808	1,870,202.64	Canal Zone.....	2	\$424.66
California.....	28,964	6,149,923.12	Guam.....	3	636.99
Colorado.....	8,049	1,709,044.17	Hawaii.....	84	17,835.72
Connecticut.....	10,003	2,123,936.99	Philippines.....	70	14,863.10
Delaware.....	2,001	552,270.33	Porto Rico.....	44	9,342.52
District of Columbia.....	8,986	1,907,997.38	Total.....	203	43,102.99
Florida.....	5,085	1,079,698.05			
Georgia.....	2,906	635,928.35	FOREIGN COUNTRIES.		
Iaho.....	2,245	476,681.85			
Illinois.....	56,482	11,992,823.05			
Indiana.....	49,987	10,613,739.71	Argentina.....	13	\$2,760.29
Iowa.....	27,821	5,907,232.98	Australia.....	101	21,445.33
Kansas.....	32,399	6,879,279.67	Austria - Hungary.....	37	7,856.21
Kentucky.....	21,350	4,535,245.50			
Louisiana.....	5,373	1,140,849.09	Belgium.....	23	4,883.59
Maine.....	14,261	3,028,038.13	Canada.....	2,879	611,298.07
Maryland.....	12,439	2,641,172.87	Chile.....	11	2,335.63
Massachusetts.....	34,124	7,245,548.92	China.....	15	3,184.95
Michigan.....	34,298	7,282,494.34	Cuba.....	61	12,952.13
Minnesota.....	12,703	2,697,227.99	Denmark.....	56	11,890.48
Mississippi.....	4,009	851,230.97	England.....	555	117,843.15
Missouri.....	39,400	8,284,911.70	France.....	76	16,137.08
Montana.....	2,364	501,948.12	Germany.....	520	110,411.60
Nebraska.....	14,364	3,049,008.12	Ireland.....	404	85,781.32
Nevada.....	399	84,719.67	Italy.....	58	12,315.14
New Hampshire.....	6,560	1,392,384.80	Japan.....	33	7,006.89
New Jersey.....	20,624	4,372,083.92	Mexico.....	136	28,878.88
New Mexico.....	1,896	402,577.68	New Zealand.....	14	2,972.62
New York.....	68,270	14,408,319.71	Norway.....	73	15,500.09
North Carolina.....	3,631	770,970.23	Peru.....	12	2,547.96
North Dakota.....	2,931	622,339.23	Russia.....	16	3,397.28
Ohio.....	77,599	16,479,146.29	Scotland.....	75	15,924.75
Oklahoma.....	11,397	2,419,925.01	South Africa.....	10	2,123.80
Oregon.....	7,798	1,655,749.34	Sweden.....	69	14,650.77
Pennsylvania.....	75,618	16,038,520.56	Switzerland.....	66	14,013.73
Rhode Island.....	4,482	951,663.06	Wales.....	26	5,520.58
South Carolina.....	1,694	359,687.02	Other foreign countries or possessions having less than 10 pensioners each and not classified.....	156	33,123.48
South Dakota.....	5,392	1,144,883.36			
Tennessee.....	16,954	3,590,842.82			
Texas.....	8,402	1,783,096.66			
Utah.....	1,026	217,850.58			
Vermont.....	6,540	1,388,638.20			
Virginia.....	8,709	1,849,181.97			
Washington.....	9,942	2,110,984.86			
West Virginia.....	10,618	2,254,519.94			
Wisconsin.....	19,776	4,199,038.08			
Wyoming.....	839	178,144.87			
Total.....	814,502	172,950,861.51	Total.....	5,405	1,166,753.35

SUMMARY.

	Pensioners.	Payments.
Pensioners residing in States and Territories and payments to them.....	814,502	\$172,950,861.51
Pensioners residing in insular possessions and Canal Zone and payments to them.....	203	43,102.99
Pensioners residing in foreign countries and payments to them.....	5,495	1,166,753.35
Total.....	820,200	174,160,717.85
Payments by Treasury Department (Treasury settlements).....		10,942.95
Total payments on account of Army and Navy pensions, 1913.....		174,171,660.80

The number of Civil War survivors on the roll at the end of the fiscal year 1912 was 497,263, and at the end of the fiscal year 1913 was 462,379.

The number of Civil War survivors on the pension roll who died during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1912, was 33,891, and the number who died during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1913, was 36,064.

Disbursements for pensions and for maintenance of pension system, 1866 to 1913.

[Report of the Commissioner of Pensions, p. 9.]

Fiscal year.	Paid as pensions.	Cost, maintenance, and expenses.	Total.	Number of pensioners.
1866.....	\$15,450,549.88	\$407,165.00	\$15,857,714.88	126,722
1867.....	20,784,789.69	490,977.35	21,275,767.04	155,474
1868.....	23,101,509.36	553,020.34	23,654,529.70	169,643
1869.....	28,513,247.27	564,526.81	29,077,774.08	187,963
1870.....	29,351,488.78	600,997.86	29,952,486.64	198,686
1871.....	28,518,792.62	863,079.00	29,381,871.62	207,495
1872.....	29,732,746.81	951,253.00	30,703,999.81	232,229
1873.....	26,982,063.89	1,003,200.64	27,985,264.53	235,411
1874.....	30,206,778.99	966,794.13	31,173,573.12	236,241
1875.....	29,270,404.76	982,695.35	30,253,100.11	234,821
1876.....	27,936,209.53	1,015,078.81	28,951,288.34	232,137
1877.....	28,182,821.72	1,034,459.33	29,217,281.05	232,104
1878.....	26,786,009.44	1,032,500.09	27,818,509.53	223,998
1879.....	33,664,428.92	837,734.14	34,502,163.06	242,755
1880.....	56,689,229.08	935,027.28	57,624,256.36	256,802
1881.....	50,583,405.35	1,072,059.64	51,655,464.99	268,830
1882.....	54,313,172.05	1,466,236.01	55,779,408.06	283,697
1883.....	60,427,573.81	2,591,648.29	63,019,222.10	303,658
1884.....	57,912,387.47	2,835,181.00	60,747,568.47	322,756
1885.....	65,171,937.12	3,392,576.34	68,564,513.46	345,125
1886.....	64,091,142.90	3,245,016.61	67,336,159.51	365,783
1887.....	73,752,997.08	3,753,400.91	77,506,397.99	406,007
1888.....	78,950,501.67	3,515,057.27	82,465,558.94	432,557
1889.....	88,842,720.58	3,466,968.40	92,309,688.98	489,725
1890.....	106,093,850.39	3,526,382.13	109,620,232.52	537,944
1891.....	117,312,690.50	4,700,636.44	122,013,326.94	676,160
1892.....	139,394,147.11	4,898,665.80	144,292,812.91	876,068
1893.....	156,906,637.94	4,897,734.42	161,734,372.36	966,012
1894.....	139,986,726.17	3,963,976.31	143,950,702.48	969,544
1895.....	139,812,294.30	4,338,020.21	144,150,314.51	970,524
1896.....	138,220,704.46	3,991,375.61	142,212,080.07	970,678
1897.....	139,949,717.35	3,987,783.07	143,937,500.42	976,014
1898.....	144,651,879.80	4,114,091.46	148,765,971.26	993,714
1899.....	138,355,052.95	4,147,517.73	142,502,570.68	991,519
1900.....	138,462,130.65	3,841,706.74	142,303,837.39	993,592
1901.....	138,531,483.84	3,868,795.44	142,400,279.28	997,735
1902.....	137,504,267.99	3,831,378.96	141,335,646.95	999,446
1903.....	137,759,653.71	3,993,216.79	141,752,870.50	996,545
1904.....	141,093,571.49	3,849,366.25	144,942,937.74	994,762
1905.....	141,142,861.33	3,721,832.82	144,864,694.15	998,441
1906.....	139,000,288.25	3,523,269.51	142,523,557.76	985,971
1907.....	138,155,412.46	3,309,110.44	141,464,522.90	967,371
1908.....	153,093,086.27	2,800,963.36	155,894,049.63	951,687
1909.....	161,973,703.77	2,852,583.73	164,826,287.50	946,194
1910.....	159,974,056.08	2,657,673.86	162,631,729.94	921,083
1911.....	157,325,160.35	2,517,127.06	159,842,287.41	892,098
1912.....	152,986,483.72	2,448,857.31	155,435,341.03	860,294
1913.....	174,171,660.80	2,543,246.59	176,714,907.39	820,200
Total.....	4,461,094,380.45	125,871,965.64	4,586,966,346.09

SPECIAL ACTS.

[Report of Commissioner of Pensions, p. 9.]

Since 1861 there have been allowed by special acts of Congress 42,337 pensions and increases of pensions, of which 22,016 are now on the roll, with an annual face value of \$6,699,096. Only a part of this is properly chargeable to special acts, as most of the beneficiaries had been previously pensioned under general laws at lower rates.

From June 30, 1912, and thereafter during the Sixty-second Congress, 2,871 persons were included in the special acts passed at the rates specified in the summary following:

Pensions granted by special act during the Sixty-second Congress subsequent to June 30, 1912.

Rates specified.	Number granted.	Rates specified.	Number granted.	Rates specified.	Number granted.
\$100.....	3	\$20.....	398	Inoperative:	
\$50.....	98	\$18.....	6	\$50.....	8
\$46.....	1	\$17.....	6	\$40.....	4
\$45.....	2	\$16.....	32	\$36.....	9
\$40.....	116	\$15.....	20	\$30.....	33
\$36.....	164	\$14.....	2	\$24.....	16
\$35.....	2	\$12.....	403	\$20.....	3
\$30.....	972	\$10.....	15	\$16.....	4
\$25.....	16	\$8.....	9	\$12.....	4
\$24.....	518	\$6.....	7		
				Total.....	2,871

Of the above, 461 were granted to persons not in receipt of a pension and 2,410 to persons then receiving smaller pensions.

The annual value of said special-act pensions is \$864,624, and the annual increase due to the same is \$407,157.

The following statement shows the number of pensions and increases of pensions granted by special acts during each Congress since March 4, 1861:

Number of pensions granted by special acts each Congress since Mar. 4, 1861.

Congress.	Number.	Congress.	Number.
Thirty-seventh (1861-1863).....	12	Fifty-first (1889-1891).....	1,388
Thirty-eighth (1863-1865).....	27	Fifty-second (1891-1893).....	217
Thirty-ninth (1865-1867).....	138	Fifty-third (1893-1895).....	110
Fortieth (1867-1869).....	275	Fifty-fourth (1895-1897).....	378
Forty-first (1869-1871).....	85	Fifty-fifth (1897-1899).....	694
Forty-second (1871-1873).....	167	Fifty-sixth (1899-1901).....	1,391
Forty-third (1873-1875).....	182	Fifty-seventh (1901-1903).....	2,171
Forty-fourth (1875-1877).....	98	Fifty-eighth (1903-1905).....	3,355
Forty-fifth (1877-1879).....	230	Fifty-ninth (1905-1907).....	6,030
Forty-sixth (1879-1881).....	96	Sixtieth (1907-1909).....	6,600
Forty-seventh (1881-1883).....	216	Sixty-first (1909-1911).....	9,649
Forty-eighth (1883-1885).....	598	Sixty-second (1911-1913).....	6,350
Forty-ninth (1885-1887).....	856		
Fiftieth (1887-1889).....	1,015	Total.....	42,337

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, before the passage of the Underwood tariff bill it was generally known that the rates would be reduced, and many importers ordered and purchased goods and produce for delivery after the passage of the legislation. The bill itself became a law on the 3d day of October, 1913, and for the next two or three months imports were exceedingly heavy.

I intend this afternoon to call your attention to some of the importations during the four months following its enactment—October, November, and December of 1913 and January of 1914—one-third of a year. I take it that I will not underestimate the importations for the year if I assume that they will be three times as great as the amount received during those four months, and upon that basis I have made some calculations to which I invite your attention.

Now, gentlemen, I suppose no political party can frame a tariff bill that will be satisfactory in all particulars to all of the people of the United States, or even satisfactory to all the members of the party fashioning it. There are things in the recent tariff bill objectionable to me. The bill was made for the entire country—for the West and the East and the South and the North.

The State of Minnesota differs in many respects from other States. It has different interests, and naturally they appeal strongly to one who comes from that State. For instance, during the last three years, both in quantity and in value, more than one-half of all the iron ore produced and marketed in the United States came from the State of Minnesota. It by far outranks any other State in the production of iron ore.

Minnesota, too, is a great agricultural State, not so great as the greatest agricultural State of all, Illinois, but a State that ranks high. I notice that in the production of oats last year Illinois stood first; Iowa, second; Minnesota, third; in the production of wheat North Dakota stood first; Kansas, second; and Minnesota, third; in the production of barley Minnesota stood first.

I speak of these things simply to indicate the importance that a representative from Minnesota may attach to the particular things in which that State is so prominent. It has been called the bread-and-butter State of the Union. Its flour, from which the bread is made, is sold all over the world, and its dairy butter is famous throughout the country. The largest flour mill in the world is located in the metropolis of the State—the Pillsbury A flour mill, with a capacity of 15,000 barrels a day, and actually making 11,000 barrels of flour every day. One-fourth of the entire flour output of the United States goes out of the city of Minneapolis. I spoke of its being the leading State in the production of barley. The enormous amount of 49,727,130 bushels of that cereal were produced there in 1913; more than the total production of Canada.

I said that the tariff bill was made for no particular State, but for all of the States of the Union. Of course there were a great many people who were dissatisfied with it because some privilege or some benefit or some favor that they had enjoyed under former tariff laws had been taken away. Some of us may have unduly exaggerated its importance because it was a measure of our political party. Others were bound to find fault with it, bound to quarrel with it, because it was a measure of our party and not of theirs. It has its enemies; and while I would not charge anyone, no matter how partisan he

may be, with desiring panics, hard times, and business depression in order that some political advantage may be worked out of them, I can not but believe that the persistent attempts to decry the bill and to misrepresent its effects cause apprehension and distrust throughout the country, and apprehension and distrust usually breed industrial stagnation and disaster.

Out through the Northwest it has been stated repeatedly that it is a bill which discriminates against the North and favors the South. I take it no one really believes that the persons who made the bill attempted to favor any particular section of the country or attempted to injure any section of it.

An examination of the items of the bill gives little color for any such charge. For instance—and I shall refer to this but briefly, for I have other matters to discuss—an effort was made to put upon the free list the things entering into the production of manufactured products—the raw materials. Raw silk is not produced in this country. It is on the free list. Cotton in the South and wool in the North are on the free list. Flax in the North and hemp in the South have been treated just alike. They are on the free list. Iron ore produced in the North and in the South, lumber on the Pacific coast and in the South, and cattle raised in the West, the North, and the South were put upon the free list. The barley of Minnesota and the rice of Louisiana were treated just the same, the duty being reduced 50 per cent. The potatoes of Maine and the sweet potatoes of the South were treated exactly the same.

Not all of those who opposed tariff reduction gave themselves over to denunciation, however. It gives me pleasure to read here to-day the words of one who was perhaps as much opposed to the present tariff law as any one in this Chamber, and who is not converted yet. He accepted it as an American business man and patriotic citizen should accept it. I read what William M. Wood, head of the American Woolen Co., said concerning this tariff bill after its passage. He was opposed to it, is opposed to it to-day, but I commend to you the spirit in which he received the enactment of the American Congress:

OPTIMISTIC.

We have a new tariff. All criticism of the bill, pro and con, is of the past. The matter is settled—it is as desired by the majority—it is the law.

American people are accustomed to taking conditions as they find them and forcing their way to success. Our forefathers hewed the forests, quarried the rock, and dammed the streams. Their sons developed the land, raised their livestock, and manufactured what was required for their simple needs. Succeeding generations tilled the soil, worked the mines, and manufactured goods to a degree never before known to man.

American industry typifies a genius which has no equal throughout the world.

To excel in manufacture is a birthright handed down to every American by his forefathers—and to-day, with conditions changed, with temporary annoyances balking our endeavors, we mean to claim our birthright.

Now, after words such as these, it is refreshing to read this news item under date of March 26, 1914:

WOOLEN MILLS BOOM UNDER LOWER TARIFF.

BOSTON, March 25.

The American Woolen Co.'s gross business thus far this year is nearly twice that of a year ago, and although the prices named on its goods to stimulate this activity have been very close, the outlook is more promising than at any time since the new tariff came into being.

It is noticeable that the bulk of 1914 orders has been of staples which form the output of the big Lawrence mills.

[Applause.]

When you find a man who does not like tariff reduction, but realizes that it is the law of the land, and instead of barking and howling about it says, "I will do the best I can under it," it is pleasant to learn of his success and to hear that his business has nearly doubled.

Another thing that has been said about this tariff bill is that it discriminates against the farmer of the country, and that he suffers greatly because of it. Early in March of this year the steamship *Empress of Asia* brought 12,000 cases of eggs from China to Vancouver. Six thousand cases were consigned to San Francisco and 6,000 to Vancouver. During the months preceding there had been importations of eggs from China, and although I have made no investigation I believe there were few eggs imported from that country prior to the passage of the tariff act. This was not on account of the amount of the tariff duty, but because it was a specific duty. The eggs exported from China are very small and inferior. They command a low price in the market. Sixty per cent of them go to Germany. Our duty upon eggs was a specific duty of 5 cents a dozen; it made no difference whether the eggs were large and fair or whether they were small and inferior. The very duty itself, because it was a specific duty, discriminated against the poorer product. Had the duty of 5 cents a dozen been changed to 30 per cent ad valorem Chinese eggs would have come in here, because then there would have been no discrimination. Five cents a dozen on eggs worth 10 cents a dozen is 50 per cent

ad valorem; on eggs worth 20 cents a dozen only 25 per cent ad valorem. But the Payne-Aldrich tariff men thought they could make capital out of these importations of eggs. There went up a cry throughout the country "China with its millions of people, and presumably billions of hens, is attacking the United States egg market, and the American hen will be driven out of business." Not long after that the Philadelphia Public Ledger, on April 17 of this year, announced the loss by the western farmer of the corn trade in the East.

The article stated that the seaboard markets are either chock-full of corn from Argentina or that corn is coming in in large amounts. We produce in the United States 75 per cent of all the corn raised in the world, and yet because corn comes here from Argentina they tell us our corn trade is ruined. Argentina with a total population less than twice the population of a single American city. They will send their corn here and drive our farmers out of business. We are told that chilled or frozen beef is coming into the United States from Argentina at the rate of 9,000,000 pounds monthly. What a wonderful country that is, sending corn here to destroy our corn market and sending beef here to destroy our beef market.

Now, we do not export a large percentage of our corn, even though twice as many bushels as Argentina will send here. We feed it to steers, and market corn-fed beef. There is nothing better on the market. In Argentina they do not do it that way. They ship the corn—practically all of it—they do not themselves eat, and feed their cattle on alfalfa. We are in no serious danger from the competition of alfalfa-fed cattle against corn-fed cattle.

But I have some figures. I may as well confine myself to these three things—eggs, corn, and beef. Eggs carried a duty of 5 cents a dozen; now they are on the free list. Corn, 15 cents a bushel; now on the free list. Beef, 1½ cents a pound; also on the free list. On these products the duty was entirely removed. Wheat, from a duty of 25 cents a bushel, was reduced to 10 cents a bushel. Potatoes, from a duty of 25 cents a bushel, was reduced to 10 per cent ad valorem. Oats, from a duty of 15 cents a bushel, was reduced to 6 cents a bushel. Barley, from a duty of 30 cents a bushel, was reduced to 15 cents a bushel. Cleaned rice, from a duty of 2 cents a pound, was reduced to 1 cent a pound. Butter, from a duty of 6 cents, was reduced to 2½ cents. So I have selected the three that are on the free list where the greatest importations might be expected.

I am particularly struck with the fact that nearly all these dreaded importations come from Argentina. The Argentine Republic, with a large area, about one-third of the United States, has an approximate population of seven and a half million people. Thirty thousand of them are Indians and one million and a quarter of them live in one large city, the capital, Buenos Aires, where the cost of living is higher, I am informed, than in any other place in the western world. How many of the remainder of this population are farmers I do not know, but there are numerous cities and towns. The agricultural population is not very large. Do you think they can capture the American markets?

Now, gentlemen, we endeavored to make what is called a competitive tariff, and by a competitive tariff we mean one that will permit the importation into the markets of this country of things that will compete with things produced in this country but sold in noncompetitive markets. If a dozen men or a dozen corporations control the output of an article, and they make an agreement to sell it at a certain price, there is no competition, and we ought to have importations from abroad, if we can get them, in order to secure competition, so that there may be a fair and competitive market in which the American consumer can trade.

We admit that wherever prices are controlled by combinations or agreements or by monopoly and we can bring in like products from other countries uncontrolled by any such agreement or monopoly, there will be a tendency toward price reduction. But where we have competition at home, where there is strong domestic competition, then the importation of other products from abroad will not materially affect the prices unless the quantity is so great as to create an oversupply.

The farmers of this country are in no combination; they have no agreement; they constitute no monopoly; they are competitors and always have been competitors and always will be competitors. A man who raises wheat or who raises corn or who brings eggs to the market is in no combination, and he sells under no agreement as to price. There is full and free competition, and the price at which he sells is not affected by the increase or the decrease of importations unless such increase or decrease be large enough either to create an oversupply or to bring about a scarcity.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMOND. I will.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota to the fact that American beef this spring is as high as it has been for several years past, notwithstanding the importation of Argentine beef.

Mr. HAMMOND. I am going to give to the House what seems to me to be an absolute demonstration that the prices of beef and of farm products are higher this spring than one year ago.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I want to ask the gentleman if he thinks that is a fair comparison?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Take, for instance, corn. We had last year only about a three-quarters crop, and, as the gentleman well knows, when there is a shortage of a crop as a general rule it is followed by an increase in the price of that article. For instance, in Kansas last year they produced 23,000,000 bushels of corn. If it sold at 60 cents a bushel, that would mean \$13,000,000. The year before they produced 180,000,000 bushels of corn, which, if sold at 60 cents, would have yielded them more than \$100,000,000. Does the gentleman think that the farmers of Kansas ought to be satisfied last year with \$13,000,000 for the corn crop when they had \$100,000,000 the year before?

Mr. HAMMOND. Permit me to answer. There was a shortage of the corn crop last year, a shortage so great that it would take 30 years of the Argentine importations to make it up. The gentleman's reasoning is very good, but let me tell the gentleman that during the same year we did not have a shortage in the wheat crop, but we had a bumper crop, and the price of wheat is higher than it was a year ago. There is no shortage about that. Now, I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Pardon me for calling attention to the Democratic platform, which has been somewhat discredited lately in spots, but was it not a declaration of that platform that protection was the cause of high prices and that you proposed to reduce high prices by reducing duties?

Mr. HAMMOND. I think I understand the gentleman's question. The Democrats have always claimed that the prices to the consumer would be reduced somewhat by the reduction of tariff duties.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But they have not been so reduced.

Mr. HAMMOND. I will come to that in just a moment, if the gentleman will wait.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I have taken occasion to make an investigation of the prices on 12 leading farm articles for the last 10 years in the markets of Chicago and New York, and of those 12 leading farm articles for 10 years, on the 1st day of March 9 of them are higher this 1st day of March than they have been any time in the last 10 years. I shall put that in the RECORD as soon as I have an opportunity.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the gentleman intends to do that. I come to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] now. The question may be asked, in view of what I said, How is it that the farmers can get better prices for all of their products and still the high cost of living be reduced?

Mr. Chairman, I have stated our purpose was to write a competitive tariff bill, a bill that would restore competition where there is no competition. We do not expect, and can not expect by competition, to reduce prices where there is competition now, but we might expect that there would be a reduction of prices where there is no competition. There is a vast difference between the amount the farmer receives for his product and the amount the ultimate consumer pays for the same product. I think it was a Senator from North Dakota who made an estimate not very many years ago that, according to the prices charged to you and to me in the restaurant in this building, a \$75 steer would bring about \$2,000. Where market men get together and fix the prices to be charged the consumer of farm products, we hope by importation of products from abroad to beat the combination and make the price less to the man who has to buy. That does not affect the price at which the farmer sells.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Referring to the question of the importation of beef from Argentina, the gentleman stated it was about 9,000,000 pounds per month?

Mr. HAMMOND. It has been so stated.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That would be about 100,000,000 pounds of beef per year?

Mr. HAMMOND. I do not know how long it is intended to keep it up.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That would be 1 pound per annum for each person in the United States?

Mr. HAMMOND. That is a mathematical computation. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman think that would seriously reduce the price of beef to the consumer? Is that sufficient competition, in the gentleman's judgment, to reduce the price to the consumer?

Mr. HAMMOND. No; it is not sufficient competition to reduce the price materially to the consumer; neither is it sufficient competition or importation upon which the opponents of tariff reduction can base a claim that we are upon the verge of ruin because of importations from Argentina.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Did not your Democratic President hold out to the people who live in cities the prospect of cheaper commodities to go into the market basket?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Was not that the constant argument in the last campaign; and did you not, therefore, pursuant to that policy, reduce duties on farm products in order to make the things that go into the market basket cheaper?

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, I will state again to the gentleman, as I have stated several times, that we endeavored to make a competitive tariff bill, a bill that would bring competition where no competition existed, a bill that would not seriously affect the prices for which our products were sold in markets where competition did exist.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. One more question and then I shall not trouble the gentleman further. Does not the gentleman concede that the importation of Argentine corn, some of which has already gone to Chicago, the very heart of the corn belt, some of which has already gone to Oklahoma—does not the gentleman concede that the importation of this corn must force down the price of corn to the western farmer?

Mr. HAMMOND. No; I do not concede that. I answer the gentleman somewhat abruptly, if he will pardon me, simply because I wish to hurry on.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that only one carload of corn has reached Chicago, and that was sent there for experimental purposes, to see if it could be fed to chickens?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, 240,000 bushels of corn have—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must first get permission of the gentleman who has the floor. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HAMMOND. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I asked the gentleman to permit me to interpose at this place this statement in answer to the chicken-feed suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], that already 240,000 bushels of Argentine corn has been contracted for to arrive in Chicago by way of Montreal, and that corn has also—

Mr. RAINEY. I said that only one carload has gone there.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman should first address the Chair, as the Chair is insisting upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that when he rapped for order he was trying to prevent the gentleman from Illinois from interrupting the gentleman from Minnesota without permission.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I thank the Chair for his consideration.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Right along the line of the gentleman's answer to another question, in Cedar County, Iowa, a farmer wrote me that he had been offered 65 cents a bushel for his corn in the field early in November. In December, after notice had been published of the importations of large quantities of Argentine corn, he hauled it to town and sold it for 53 cents a bushel. He

did not sell for 65 because he thought it was going to 75. Now, I would like to have the gentleman tell me why corn dropped that much in the course of a month in the face of the great shortage of the corn crop in the State of Iowa, if it was not due to the importation of corn from Argentina.

Mr. HAMMOND. The gentleman knows as well as I do that prices fluctuate from month to month. I have here a list of prices, and I think the gentleman sold his corn perhaps fairly well. I notice in a little country market—

Mr. GOOD. He did not think so.

Mr. HAMMOND. Well, I can not help that. I notice in a little country market in Minnesota the price of corn the 6th of March was 50 cents; on the 20th of March it was 53 cents. Now, I do not suppose any news had reached that market of the loss of a cargo of corn bound from Argentina to the United States, and that the reported loss of such a cargo caused corn to go up 3 cents. Markets fluctuate, but not on account of Argentine activity. The prices of farm products are much better since this tariff law went into effect than before. I am not going to deal in buncombe. I do not claim the tariff has made farm prices better, but I do claim that it has not affected them.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I would like to ask the gentleman a question—

Mr. HAMMOND. I think I will have to decline to yield to the gentleman. I am very sorry.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Very well.

Mr. HAMMOND. The Payne-Aldrich tariff advocates say when importations come into this country the supply is greater and the price is less. I will grant you that importations of any product would naturally decrease the price.

If, first, there is but one market for the domestic product, because if there are dozens of other markets then the product will find the market where the demand exists. If Argentina, for instance, should, instead of exporting her products to the countries of Europe, send them all here, then the countries of Europe would find some market in which to purchase the things formerly obtained from Argentina. Increased importations may reduce the price if there is but one market in which to sell the commodity. If, second, the supply is very largely increased—I might carry a cupful of water from Lake Champlain and throw it into Lake Superior. It would increase the amount of water in Lake Superior, but the result would not be appreciable. It would not affect navigation of the lake, and so it is true that infinitesimal importations are not going to affect prices. If, third, the demand or the consumption is not correspondingly increased, of course if there is a greater demand in the country than there was formerly, then the importations would not affect prices; they would simply meet the demand.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMOND. In just a moment. Will the chairman of the committee give me 15 minutes more?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; I will yield 15 minutes additional to the gentleman. I believe I told the gentleman that if it was needed I would give him an hour.

Mr. HAMMOND. I will now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. As I understand the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON], he complains that 240,000 bushels of corn are threatened to be imported into Chicago. That would be, upon the basis of about 3,000,000 of population which the city of Chicago has, a little over a quart of corn to each inhabitant of Chicago. I wish to ask the gentleman if he thinks that that quart of corn to each inhabitant would glut the market and decrease the price of corn?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan rose.

Mr. HAMMOND. I must decline to yield. I will answer the question of the gentleman from Kentucky by saying that I think—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I really would enjoy answering—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HAMMOND. I do not think that we will be seriously affected by the importation of corn from Argentina.

Mr. RAINEY. Will the gentleman yield for just one remark?

Mr. HAMMOND. I will.

Mr. RAINEY. I want to say I have investigated the question of the shipment of Argentine corn to Chicago, and it costs 22 cents a bushel for freight alone to ship from the upper Plate corn from the Argentine Republic to Chicago. I have investigated the question, and I find this feed store over on the

corner, which is the largest in the city, reports that they can not bring Argentine corn here and sell it as cheaply as they can bring in Ohio yellow corn, and this market in Washington is supplied at the present time with Ohio yellow corn cheaper than it can be brought from Argentina.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMOND. I will yield now.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Concerning first the observation of the gentleman—

Mr. HAMMOND. I can not yield for a statement.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Then I will ask the gentleman a question. Is it not true that the water rate on corn from Argentina to New York is from 5 to 7½ cents a bushel?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes; I think so.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And the water rate on corn from Argentina to Chicago by way of Montreal is a little over 7 cents instead of being 24 cents. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] is just the same sort of a lightning calculator as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THOMAS]. Is it not true, also, that this Argentine corn has taken all the New England market away from the corn growers of the West, and that the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad has made a new freight rate from tidewater to New England ports? And is it not true that for several months past little corn has gone from the corn belt to New York? And is it not true, further, that the Corn Products Co. is buying 75 per cent of the Argentine corn?

Mr. HAMMOND. The gentleman is in error as to the rate from Argentina to Chicago. Argentine corn has not captured the New England markets. I can not remember all his questions, but with the exception of his first statement in reference to the rate from Argentina to New York the statements are incorrect.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And that is the only one you undertake to answer?

Mr. HAMMOND. I state that they are not so, and I know of no other way to answer incorrect statements.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Have you any figures with which to refute them?

Mr. HAMMOND. I have them; yes.

I proposed taking up as well as I might three things—eggs, corn, and beef. I am trying to be fair about this. I am assuming that the importations for the first four months after the tariff passed, for the reasons I have given, are as large or larger than they will be in any other four months of the year. So in calculating the importations for a year I have multiplied the amount for the four months by three. We imported in October, November, December, 1913, and January, 1914, 2,885,561 dozen eggs into this country. They were worth \$612,759. At the same rate for the year the total value of our importations would be \$1,838,277. Now, we exported in 1912 \$3,395,953 worth. Our exports of eggs, therefore, are double our imports. The average price paid for the eggs we exported in 1912, the average price paid to us, was 22 cents a dozen, and the average import price on eggs brought into the United States was 13.7 cents a dozen. I submit there is not very much harm in importing eggs at about 14 cents a dozen if we can export twice as many at 22 cents a dozen.

But a little more in connection with this matter. The consumption of eggs in the United States in 1910 was an amount valued at \$320,739,375. The imports for this year are about one-half of 1 per cent of our consumption. I said a little while ago that I could put more water in Lake Superior by carrying a cupful from Lake Champlain, but it would not materially affect Lake Superior. Now, gentlemen, do you think, with our consumption of \$320,000,000 worth of a product, we are going to be seriously affected by importations of one-half of 1 per cent? Why, we produced in the United States in 1910 1,591,000,000 dozens of eggs. In 1900, 10 years before, we produced 1,293,000,000 dozens of eggs. The gain in 10 years was 297,000,000 dozens; and during that period the State of Missouri alone, which produced more eggs than any other State in 1910, gained in production 26,613,403 dozens. The 26,000,000 dozens gained in the State of Missouri in 10 years is a greater number than the total exports of eggs from China to the entire world, and 60 per cent of those exports go to the German Empire.

In the course of marketing eggs in the United States three-tenths of them are damaged from bad handling and one-tenth are broken; that is, one egg out of every ten is broken; and we can not do what the king and all his men could not do—we can not put it together again. It is lost. If the American people would exercise a little more care and, instead of breaking as many eggs as they break now, would break only half as many we would save each year 79,000,000 dozen eggs, and it would take nine years for the importations of eggs coming from China and from all other places to this country to make up that number.

Now, in reference to corn. The total corn importations in October, November, and December, 1913, and January, 1914, were 7,034,159 bushels. That would make for a year 21,102,477 bushels. Our exports in 1912, including corn meal, were 41,797,291 bushels; so our exports are just about double our imports. In 1912 we had an enormous production—3,124,746,000 bushels. But while that production was enormous, it was not abnormal. Our exports and our imports combined are only about 2 per cent of that production.

The importations are about two-thirds of 1 per cent, so we are in no immediate danger of having our markets taken away from us. A gentleman asked me if it is not true that certain markets—I do not remember where they were—had been taken away from the western farmer by the Argentine corn. What nonsense! Taken away by some portion of two-thirds of 1 per cent. Of course it is not true. The statement is based upon some such article as that which appeared in the Philadelphia Ledger, stating that the seaboard markets are chock full of corn and more is on the way.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] spoke about the corn shortage. Our shortage in 1913 was 677,748,000 bushels, a tremendous amount. But even with that shortage the United States of America produced 68 per cent of all the corn raised in the world.

In North and South America there are 130,000,000 acres of land planted to corn—105,000,000 in the United States, 13,000,000 in Mexico, and 10,000,000 in Argentina.

Argentine corn brings a less price in our markets than does American corn. I am told that it responds to chemical tests and is good corn. But in our country we like the yellow dent corn. It looks the best. I believe it is the best. Anyway it commands a price in the market that the Argentine corn does not often reach. Argentine corn is largely of the flint variety.

That is not alone true in the United States. We have been sending our corn to Great Britain and Argentina has been sending its corn to Great Britain, one the competitor of the other, and three years out of five the American corn brought the better price.

Before I refer to the importations of beef, let me say a word concerning wheat: Notwithstanding the statements industriously circulated by those who desire to create a prejudice among the farmers against the present tariff law, and who do not hesitate to use misrepresentations in their attempts to arouse such prejudice, wheat imported into this country is subject to a duty of 10 cents a bushel, except wheat from Argentina. Russia, including Asiatic Russia, is the greatest wheat-raising nation of the world, but should any of its product come to American ports a duty of 10 cents a bushel would be levied upon it. The Canadian wheat crop is, perhaps, one-third of our own, and the wheat raised in Western Canada is of excellent quality. During the past year, much of the time, the Canadian price was better than our own. Just how they compare now I can not say, but, generally speaking, the Minneapolis price is better than the Winnipeg price. American farmers, as a general thing, receive a better price for their wheat than do their Canadian neighbors. The difference in price, or the spread between the markets, is less than 10 cents a bushel, save in exceptional cases, but the Canadians can not bring their wheat into our markets without paying a duty of 10 cents a bushel on it. The tariff law levies a duty of 10 cents a bushel on wheat imported into this country from any country that imposes a duty upon wheat or products of wheat imported from this country into it. Now, under this provision wheat might be imported free of duty into the United States from Finland, the Netherlands, Denmark, Great Britain, and Argentina. The wheat raisers of this country were told that so valuable is the American market that the Canadian Government would hasten to remove all of its duties on wheat and wheat products, so that it might send its wheat free of duty into the United States. In a speech by me in April, 1913, in support of the present tariff law, I said:

But certain gentlemen say: "Do not you know that just the moment this bill becomes a law Canada, through her governor general or some other official who has the power, with one stroke of the pen will strike out the duty now imposed on American flour, so that Canadian flour may come into the United States?" No, Mr. Chairman; we do not know it, nor does anyone else know it, but those acquainted with the history of recent tariff enactments have good reason to believe that Canada will do nothing of the kind.

Mr. Collins, the editor of an agricultural paper published in Minnesota, who champions the Payne-Aldrich tariff law and loses no opportunity to make statements he thinks may discredit the present tariff law, in a letter written to the American Economist—the organ of high protection—under date of December 27, 1913, stated:

There is not one chance in a million of Canada's failing to remove her tariff on American grain, since it is protection only on paper and

not in reality, for, of course, we are not sending American grain over into Saskatchewan or Manitoba.

We might send wheat into Saskatchewan and Manitoba, but it would not ruin the Canadian wheat market if we did. So Argentina may send some wheat to the United States, but it would not ruin the American wheat market if it does.

But to continue with Canada. On January 30 of this year a free-wheat amendment was proposed to the address in reply to the speech from the throne in the Canadian Parliament and was defeated by a vote of 102 to 57. This was in the nature of a test vote and clearly indicated that the Canadians had no intention of removing their tariff duties in order to send wheat into the United States. On April 7 of this year the minister of finance of the Canadian Government made his annual budget statement, and the proposition to remove the duty on wheat and wheat products was finally rejected. So unless there is a decided change of opinion in Canada wheat coming from the Dominion into the United States will pay a tariff duty of 10 cents a bushel.

So free-wheat importations must come from Argentina. The wheat crop of Argentina for 1912-13 was 198,000,000 bushels. I can not give the exports for that year, but for 1911 83,993,460 bushels were exported. The wheat production of the United States for 1912 was over 730,000,000 bushels, and for 1913 it was 763,380,000 bushels. Our exports of wheat in 1912 were 30,160,212 bushels, valued at \$28,477,584. Now, the wheat we exported was sold in the markets of the world in competition with the wheat from Argentina and wheat from other parts of the world. If we can sell over \$28,000,000 worth of this cereal in the world's markets in competition with the wheat raised in other countries, is it not reasonable to suppose we can successfully market our crop in our own markets, even though we were obliged to meet such competition? The farmer who sells his wheat does not receive any less for it because it is exported; the market price of wheat is the same whether it is retained for home consumption or is sent abroad to supply a foreign demand.

The statistical department of the Argentine ministry of agriculture gives the production cost of wheat on a farm of 618 acres, 6 miles from a railroad; 4½ acres of the farm were sowed to wheat and the balance was pasturage. The cost of production was 66 cents per bushel and the yield 15 bushels to the acre—a trifle less than the Minnesota yield for 1912, which was 15.5 bushels per acre. Farm labor in Argentina is nearly as high as it is in our wheat belt.

Of course, we may expect importations of wheat from Argentina and from Canada. We imported wheat before the enactment of the Underwood tariff bill, and we will continue to import it. Our consumption is increasing, and year by year we send less of our wheat abroad, and in the natural course of things the imports will be greater and greater as the consumption in this country increases, because the increase in production is not keeping up with the increase in consumption.

The gentleman from Iowa who referred to the shortage in the corn crop attributed the better prices of corn this year over last year to that shortage. The tables I am submitting show that wheat is selling at a better price this year than last year, and that can not be due to a wheat shortage, for we raised last year the biggest crop of wheat ever produced in this country.

The importations of wheat have not affected the price, nor have the importations of corn affected the price; that is, they have not affected the price the man who raises the wheat and the corn receives for his product. If wheat or corn in a given market place is cornered or monopolized, and the price thereby raised, then importations may tend to bring down that price. Then there will be competition where there was no competition.

Since Argentine wheat may come into this country free of duty we may look for increased importations from the southern Republic, but every bushel of the wheat, manufactured or unmanufactured, coming here, lessens Argentina's exports to other countries by just one bushel, and those other countries will seek to purchase that bushel somewhere else.

In 1911 the importations of wheat into the United Kingdom from Argentina were a little larger than from the United States, but the next year—1912—the Argentine importations, although considerably greater than the year before, were less than those from the United States. The United Kingdom must have wheat, either made into flour to feed the English people or for its great port mills, where it is made into flour. Let the importations from Argentina fall off, the greater will be the demand for American wheat; let the American supply fail, the greater will be the demand for the Argentine crop. As I said before, it matters not to the farmer, when he hauls his wheat to the elevator and receives his pay for it, whether that wheat remains in the

United States or goes out of the United States; there is always a market somewhere for the staff of life.

Potatoes, too, like wheat, are subject to duty when imported into the United States, if they come from a country that imposes duties upon potatoes imported from the United States. Canada has a tariff upon potatoes, so when imported from Canada they are subject to an ad valorem tariff charge of 10 per cent. During the first four months under the new tariff law there were imported into the United States 3,261,705 bushels of potatoes. This would indicate a total annual importation of somewhat less than 10,000,000 bushels. The advocates of special privilege, in their attacks upon the Underwood law, will try to make the farmers believe that such a tremendous importation as 10,000,000 bushels will compel them to sell their potatoes for less than heretofore, and probably some farmers will believe them; but they would take little stock in the argument of these opponents of low tariff if they knew that during the year 1912 the United States imported nearly 14,000,000 bushels of potatoes. If the farmers could prosper with so large an amount of potatoes coming in here, it is quite likely they will get along comfortably under the new tariff law with importations nearly a third less.

I now present market statements of St. James, Minn., March 7, 1913, March 6, 1914, and March 20, 1914. They are taken from a weekly paper published there.

It appears that in nearly every instance the prices are better this year than last year. These are the prices the farmer receives:

Comparative statement of market prices for March, 1913, and March, 1914, at St. James, Minn., and market prices at Slayton, Minn., for April, 1913, and April, 1914.

	St. James market.		
	Mar. 7, 1913.	Mar. 6, 1914.	Mar. 20, 1914.
Grains:			
Wheat No. 1.....	\$0.78	\$0.82	\$0.85
Wheat No. 2.....	.76	.80	.83
Wheat No. 3.....	.73	.77	.80
Oats.....	.26	.32	.32
Corn.....	.35	.50	.53
Barley.....	.40	.45	.45
Rye.....	.45	.48	.48
Flax.....	1.15	1.40	1.45
Produce:			
Eggs.....	.18	.24	.16
Dairy butter.....	.25	.25	.25
Potatoes.....	.35	.75	.75
Live stock:			
Hogs.....	\$7.40 to 7.50	\$7.90 to 8.00	\$8.00 to 8.10
Steers.....	5.25 to 7.75	5.25 to 8.00	5.25 to 8.00
Heifers.....	3.50 to 6.50	4.00 to 6.75	4.00 to 6.75
Cows.....	3.50 to 6.50	4.00 to 6.50	4.00 to 6.50
Veal.....	4.25 to 7.75	4.00 to 8.50	4.00 to 8.50
Sheep.....	4.50 to 6.25	2.50 to 4.50	2.50 to 4.50
Lambs.....	4.25 to 6.25	5.25 to 6.75	5.25 to 6.75
Poultry:			
Chickens.....	.08	.10	.10
Ducks.....	.08	.08 to .10	.08 to .10
Geese.....	.08	.07 to .11	.07 to .11
Turkeys.....	.12	.10	.10

	Slayton market.	
	Apr. 17, 1913.	Apr. —, 1914.
Grains:		
Wheat No. 1.....	(¹)	(¹)
Wheat No. 2.....	\$0.70 to \$0.73	\$0.79 to \$0.82
Wheat No. 3.....		
Oats.....	.25 to .26	.32
Corn.....	.43	.55½ to .58½
Barley.....	.40	.47
Rye.....	(¹)	(¹)
Flax.....	(¹)	(¹)
Produce:		
Eggs.....	.14	.16
Dairy butter.....	(²)	(²)
Potatoes.....	(¹)	(¹)
Live stock:		
Hogs.....	(¹)	(¹)
Steers.....	(¹)	(¹)
Heifers.....	(¹)	(¹)
Cows.....	(¹)	(¹)
Veal.....	(¹)	(¹)
Sheep.....	(¹)	(¹)
Lambs.....	(¹)	(¹)
Poultry:		
Chickens.....	(¹)	(¹)
Ducks.....	(¹)	(¹)
Geese.....	(¹)	(¹)
Turkeys.....	(¹)	(¹)

¹ Not shown on report quoted.

² Not quoted.

³ 3 cents lower than 1913.

Just a word about importations of meat. We must import meat, tariff or no tariff. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] asked me if I thought the importations of meat would reduce its cost to the consumer, and I said that I feared they would not materially reduce the cost. I had in mind importations of beef from Argentina. The export business of that country is mainly controlled by American packers. There are nine establishments for slaughtering, chilling or freezing, and exporting beef located in or near Buenos Aires; five are owned or operated by Chicago houses. We would indeed be credulous were we to believe that these Chicago-controlled companies in Argentina will bring their Argentine beef to the United States for the purpose of lowering the price of their American beef. As I have stated several times, we may look for reduced prices when importations will give us competition, but there is no competition between Chicago packers in the United States and Chicago packers in Argentina.

Why do I say, "We must have importations"? This is the reason: In 1910 there were 41,178,000 meat cattle in the United States; in January, 1914, 35,855,000. During the last four years there has been an average annual decrease of 1,330,000, or 3.3 per cent. In 1910 there were in the United States 52,448,000 sheep; in January, 1914, 49,719,000; an average annual decrease since 1910 of 682,000, or 1.3 per cent. In 1910 there were in this country 58,186,000 swine; January 1, 1914, there were 58,933,000, an increase for the four years of 1.3 per cent. Now, during that time, from 1910 to 1914, the population of the United States increased from 91,972,000 to 98,646,000. Compared with our population—that is, taking into account the increase of population and the decrease of sheep and cattle and the small increase in swine, and comparing their number to each 100 of the population in 1914 with the number to each 100 of the population in 1910—there is a shortage in milch cows of 4.4 per cent; in other meat cattle, 19.2 per cent; in sheep, 11.6 per cent; and in swine, 5.2 per cent.

These statements, if not in themselves alarming, certainly are reasons enough why we must have importations of meat into the United States, and we may look for such importations from Argentina.

I have been unable to find reliable statistics of the number of cattle and sheep in Argentina during the last few years, but from December, 1909, to December, 1910, the number of neat cattle increased less than 4 per cent, but the number of sheep increased about 25 per cent.

I called the attention of the House a year ago to our great increase of exports of manufactured articles and the great decrease in our exports of farm products. Our urban population is increasing much more rapidly than our rural population, and unless we materially increase the yield per acre of our land the time is not far distant when we must look beyond our own boundary lines for food. Irrespective of tariff rates or tariff changes our importations of food products are likely to increase.

From 1900 to 1910 the United States increased in population 21 per cent. In that same period the average of our cereal production increased but 3.5 per cent, and the yield in 1909 was only 1.6 per cent greater than in 1899. In 1899 we produced of cereals 58.4 bushels per head, in 1909 49.1 bushels per head. The demand for importations will bring importations, but, as I have tried to show, it does not follow that on account of the importations of farm products the farmers will receive less for the things they raise.

I have already presented market reports from two small towns in Minnesota showing that practically everything the farmer raises brings a better price this year, after the enactment of the Underwood tariff law, than last year under the Payne-Aldrich tariff. I now present a table showing the Chicago market prices. They are taken from the files of the Daily Trade Bulletin in the office of J. R. Whitney & Co., and were prepared by the Carroll Times, an Iowa paper. The quotations of prices were taken for commodities on the Chicago Board of Trade on the dates specified.

February, 1913, came in on Saturday. The dates for which quotations are given are, therefore, February 1, 8, 15, and 21. There was no session of the board of trade on Saturday, February 22, a public holiday. The Saturdays of 1914 most nearly corresponding to these were January 31, February 7, 14, and 21. These are the dates for which the following quotations were reported in the Daily Trade Bulletin, and we invite doubters to consult the files themselves for verification or refutation of the figures given by us. The corn prices quoted are the cash prices for No. 3 mixed, on track, Chicago, which is selected as a standard grade. Any other grade might be chosen, but the lesson taught by the quotations would be the same. The prices given on wheat are for No. 2 spring. The prices quoted on hogs are the lowest and highest, including both light and heavy grades, but excluding "pigs." The quotations on cattle are for "steers, medium to choice."

CORN—NO. 3 MIXED, ON TRACK, CHICAGO.

	Low.	High.
1913.		
Feb. 1.....	48	50
Feb. 8.....	49½	50½
Feb. 15.....	47½	49½
Feb. 21.....	47½	49
1914.		
Jan. 31.....	60½	63
Feb. 7.....	60	64
Feb. 14.....	59½	63
Feb. 21.....	59½	64

WHEAT—NO. 2 SPRING.

	Low.	High.
1913.		
Feb. 1.....	88	90
Feb. 8.....	88	90½
Feb. 15.....	87	89
Feb. 21.....	87	89½
1914.		
Jan. 31.....	88½	90
Feb. 7.....	89½	91½
Feb. 14.....	91	92
Feb. 21.....	93	95

LIVE HOGS—LIGHT AND HEAVY.

1913.		
Feb. 1.....	7.30	7.70
Feb. 8.....	7.85	8.10
Feb. 15.....	8.00	8.35
Feb. 21.....	8.15	8.40
1914.		
Jan. 31.....	8.25	8.50
Feb. 7.....	8.45	8.72½
Feb. 14.....	8.25	8.60
Feb. 21.....	8.40	8.75

CATTLE—STEERS, MEDIUM TO CHOICE.

1913.		
Feb. 1.....	7.50	8.25
Feb. 8.....	7.60	8.25
Feb. 15.....	7.90	8.50
Feb. 21.....	7.90	8.50
1914.		
Jan. 31.....	7.85	8.85
Feb. 7.....	7.85	8.65
Feb. 14.....	7.75	8.65
Feb. 21.....	7.85	8.60

The Chicago prices for eggs in February, 1913, ranged from 15 to 24 cents. The prices for February, 1914, have thus far ranged from 24½ to 27 cents.

Next, I present a table showing the comparative wholesale prices of 12 commodities selected from 106. In connection with this table let me say that Bradstreet's index number of commodity prices has followed a downward course this year for the third time. The fall is only three-tenths of 1 per cent for the interval between February 1 and March 1. The present index number is the lowest reported since October, 1911, and it is lower than the numbers reported on March 1, 1913, 1912, 1910, and 1907.

Now, notwithstanding this general downward tendency of prices, the 12 articles selected, being all of the farm products listed, with the exception of butter, indicate prices this year higher than those of a year ago.

Comparative wholesale prices of 12 commodities.

TWELVE QUOTATIONS RULING FOR STANDARD GRADES AT THE HIGH POINT ON DEC. 1, 1912, MAR. 1, 1913, AND MAR. 1, 1914.

[From Bradstreet's.]

Commodities.	Dec. 1, 1912.	Mar. 1, 1913.	Mar. 1, 1914.
Wheat, No. 2, red winter, in elevator.....	\$1.06	\$1.10	\$1.05
Corn, No. 2, mixed, in elevator.....	.66	.61	.725
Oats, No. 2, mixed, in elevator.....	.37	.38	.455
Barley, No. 2 (Milwaukee).....	.72	.70	.70
Rye, western.....	.68	.70	.685
(All of above per bushel.)			
Beaves, best, native steers (Chicago).....	11.00	9.00	6.65
Sheep, prime (Chicago).....	4.65	6.85	6.25
Hogs, prime (Chicago).....	7.65	8.50	8.55
(All of above per 100 pounds.)			
Milk (New York)..... per quart.....	.050275	.04275	.0475
Eggs, State, fresh (New York)..... per dozen.....	.42	.25	.31
Butter, creamery, State, best..... per pound.....	.37	.36	.315
Potatoes, eastern..... per 180 pounds.....	1.75	1.87	2.75

Last of all I present a table showing the prices paid to farmers for corn, wheat, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, potatoes, flaxseed, hay, and cotton on the 1st day of April 1914, and the 1st day of

April, 1913. The average for the United States shows higher prices this year for all of these products. This table has been prepared by the Department of Agriculture:

Prices to producers of agricultural products Apr. 1, 1914 and 1913.
[Cotton in cents per pound; hay, dollars per ton; other products, cents per bushel.]

State.	Corn.		Wheat.		Oats.		Barley.		Rye.		Buckwheat.		Potatoes.		Flaxseed.		Hay.		Cotton.	
	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913	1914	1913
Maine.....	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Dolls.	Dolls.	Cts.	Cts.
New Hampshire.....	84	68	100	116	58	49	80	72	65	70	55	40	12.80	13.70
Vermont.....	76	67	120	104	53	48	95	85	70	75	75	81	65	16.80	16.10
Massachusetts.....	75	67	101	100	53	46	87	85	70	89	95	76	63	14.90	14.10
Rhode Island.....	79	69	56	46	93	86	72	85	70	20.50	19.80
Connecticut.....	93	89	107	97	80	85	80	21.80	24.00
New York.....	79	69	70	69	80	91	100	81	77	20.00	20.80
New Jersey.....	77	64	97	101	48	43	72	73	81	67	85	57	14.80	12.90
Pennsylvania.....	77	64	97	100	47	42	65	68	75	70	82	83	67	18.70	17.80
Delaware.....	74	61	95	101	48	42	76	74	73	66	81	61	14.50	13.50
Maryland.....	70	55	97	99	40	40	75	76	105	81	16.00	14.50
Virginia.....	74	58	95	100	50	45	65	65	74	78	72	59	15.50	12.00
West Virginia.....	85	73	101	106	55	54	72	75	84	82	86	82	85	75	15.80	15.60	12.2
North Carolina.....	85	71	101	104	56	51	87	84	83	73	105	73	16.30	13.20
South Carolina.....	94	83	112	118	62	62	98	103	85	90	90	91	18.50	16.30	12.6	12.0
Georgia.....	98	89	116	124	67	64	175	150	123	128	18.30	19.00	12.6	12.0
Florida.....	94	80	122	122	65	64	134	115	150	115	125	18.20	17.60	12.8	11.9
Ohio.....	86	92	64	68	150	126	17.30	17.30	15.6	12.4
Indiana.....	64	51	93	99	39	33	57	50	68	72	80	68	80	56	12.20	10.80
Illinois.....	61	48	91	97	39	32	50	65	63	67	85	83	53	12.70	10.80
Michigan.....	64	47	88	90	38	31	55	54	62	71	100	93	91	58	13.90	12.00
Wisconsin.....	64	51	92	99	40	32	64	63	60	57	68	64	50	36	12.00	10.70
Minnesota.....	59	49	82	82	37	32	52	50	55	56	72	64	53	31	140	130	10.30	10.60
Iowa.....	52	41	83	76	32	26	45	43	51	49	62	62	53	28	136	113	6.40	6.50
Missouri.....	59	41	70	79	34	29	52	51	62	60	84	81	93	51	120	110	9.80	9.60
North Dakota.....	74	50	86	95	46	37	60	74	78	96	98	99	74	145	112	14.20	9.40	11.6	9.5
South Dakota.....	51	47	81	72	32	23	39	34	48	47	57	31	137	106	5.80	5.20
Nebraska.....	57	39	79	73	33	26	44	41	51	57	75	39	132	114	7.00	5.60
Kansas.....	63	44	75	74	37	31	52	40	57	56	75	94	53	8.50	7.20
Kentucky.....	73	48	80	78	46	40	57	42	65	67	98	77	133	130	12.10	7.60
Tennessee.....	81	64	98	103	54	49	72	82	84	88	103	66	17.20	14.10
Alabama.....	82	67	101	107	56	54	82	75	102	100	73	75	112	75	17.40	15.10	12.0	11.9
Mississippi.....	93	79	119	106	67	58	95	150	150	116	118	16.20	14.20	12.6	11.9
Louisiana.....	82	75	89	62	61	113	116	13.50	12.70	12.2	11.9
Texas.....	77	79	58	55	108	115	13.40	12.30	11.7	11.9
Oklahoma.....	88	69	95	93	50	44	63	68	104	110	113	109	13.10	10.60	11.0	11.8
Arkansas.....	74	50	81	77	48	39	68	50	93	87	109	91	11.50	7.40	11.2	11.5
Montana.....	82	72	88	94	54	55	65	95	114	102	15.20	14.40	11.3	11.8
Wyoming.....	81	59	71	65	33	39	52	48	61	68	60	52	123	129	8.00	9.70
Colorado.....	88	62	86	94	46	46	70	80	64	70	70	80	8.60	6.80
New Mexico.....	71	53	78	77	46	37	60	44	56	49	59	41	9.80	8.30
Arizona.....	72	81	79	72	40	39	79	48	113	103	14.50	11.30
Utah.....	112	95	109	101	67	80	79	77	150	95	12.00	15.00
Nevada.....	73	70	73	72	41	42	50	53	55	67	62	44	10.00	9.00
Idaho.....	112	90	101	50	52	77	88	64	45	10.00	11.00
Washington.....	76	80	68	73	34	35	48	49	90	69	55	24	8.00	7.50
Oregon.....	71	89	80	80	41	41	50	50	60	57	42	26	11.60	10.50
California.....	70	78	86	79	40	41	62	58	85	73	43	36	9.00	8.30
United States.....	83	77	97	95	52	51	66	64	110	86	73	45	11.00	14.00	12.5

From the tables which have been presented the conclusion reached is a conclusion of fact. Notwithstanding the reductions in the new tariff law and the importations which have followed its enactment, the farmers of the United States are receiving better prices for their products than they received a year ago. From the statistics which have been presented a conclusion may be reached based upon facts, and that is that there is no occasion for the farmers to fear that importations from other countries will affect the prices they can secure for their products.

The Payne-Aldrich tariff bill was denounced in the platform of the Democratic Party and in the platform of the Progressive Party; it received but faint praise in the platform of the Republican Party; it was repudiated by the people of the United States. The Democratic Party was delegated to write a new tariff law; it has accomplished its task. It promised to reduce the tariff duties; it has done so. Last October the question was squarely put to the Members of this body, "Will you vote for a tariff law reducing tariff duties, or will you stand for the Payne-Aldrich tariff schedules?" There was no other proposition; it was a choice between the Underwood tariff law and the Payne-Aldrich law. Those who voted for the Underwood bill voted against the Payne bill, and those who voted against the Underwood bill voted for the Payne bill. The supporters of the Payne-Aldrich bill have heretofore attempted to make the farmers of the country believe that the Underwood bill discriminated against their products; they will probably continue their efforts. Some farmers may believe them, but those who read and those who think will not believe them. Here are the demonstrations proving that since the new tariff law was enacted the prices of the things they sell have increased and the prices of much that they buy have decreased, and they can look forward to the certainty of good markets without fear of low prices. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. HAMMOND. Yes; if the gentleman will be quick.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the gentleman mean to tell us that the result of the tariff bill is to increase the cost of the necessities of life?

Mr. HAMMOND. I explained that fully.

Mr. AUSTIN. I was not in the Chamber at the time. I simply wanted to know if that is the gentleman's opinion, that the result of the tariff bill has been to increase the cost of the necessities of life?

Mr. HAMMOND. I made the statement that I was not trying to deal in buncombe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Minnesota use some of his time?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] one hour, or so much thereof as he desires to consume.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HINEBAUGH] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have it understood that the part of the hour which I do not use is reserved by me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the time belongs to the gentleman from Illinois in his own right.

Mr. DAVIS. That is the understanding.

Mr. BARTLETT. He has the hour to dispose of as he sees fit.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I fully realize that the subject of the recall of judicial decisions and the growth of the power of the judicial branch of our Government is a dry subject, and that very probably I shall not be able to present it to you in an entertaining manner. But the platform of the Pro-

gressive Party, upon which I was elected to this body, provided among other things as follows:

THE COURTS.

The Progressive Party demands such restriction of the power of the courts as shall leave to the people the ultimate authority to determine fundamental questions of social welfare and public policy. To secure this end, it pledges itself to provide:

1. That when an act, passed under the police power of the State, is held unconstitutional under the State constitution, by the courts, the people, after an ample interval for deliberation, shall have an opportunity to vote on the question whether they desire the act to become a law, notwithstanding such decision.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in addressing the House on this subject at this time is only to show that the basic principle of the doctrine of recall of decisions is very old, and that the protest against the ever-increasing power of the judicial branch of the Government originated with the Marbury decision, and has continued unabated ever since.

There are now eight States in which the recall has been adopted by constitutional amendment—Oregon, California, Arizona, Arkansas, Nevada, Idaho, Washington, and Colorado.

Two methods are used. The Oregon plan, which means that an official sought to be recalled appears on the ballot as a candidate for reelection. A plurality vote elects. The California plan under which the question of recall is voted on separately. If a majority of those voting vote for recall, the plurality candidate succeeds to the office. The voter, however, must vote on recall before voting for the candidate.

The doctrine of recall as applied to administrative offices is rapidly becoming popular in every State, and is not violently opposed by any political party.

The recall as sought to be applied to judges and judicial decisions is strenuously opposed by the two old parties as being revolutionary and subversive of good government. They say it is an attack on the check and balance theory of our forefathers, when they established the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government with the view of constitutional independence for each department.

Alexander Hamilton, the brilliant leader of the Federalist Party, saw that his ideas of concentrating the powers of Government could not be carried out successfully under the Constitution by means of the executive and legislative departments, because they were too responsive to the people and too easily reached by them. Hamilton did not believe in the rule of the people. He did not believe they were capable of self-government.

The defeat of Adams and the triumphant election of Jefferson, who stood for the rule of the people and the sovereignty of the State, made plain to Hamilton that the Constitution was a "frail and worthless fabric," and he immediately turned to the judicial branch of the Government as to an ark of safety, which the Constitution had placed beyond the reach of public opinion and the people.

John Marshall, who had been Secretary of State for Adams, was selected for Justice of the Supreme Court as the strongest and best equipped Federalist to carry forward Hamilton's idea of a powerful judiciary. It should be remembered that the Federalists had just been expelled, root and branch, from all those departments of the Government which under the Constitution could be reached by the people, and that Hamilton, Adams, Marshall, and their followers actually believed that the rights of persons and property and all the interests which they regarded as sacred were put in jeopardy by the election of Jefferson. Jefferson believed in the people. They feared the power of the people at the ballot box.

It is only natural to suppose that under such impressions the leaders of the Federalist Party would make haste to strengthen that branch of the Government to which they now turned to preserve their theories. Immediately after it became certain that the people had turned them out of power they availed themselves of their authority under the Constitution to establish new courts in all the States of the Confederacy and in the District of Columbia. Adams appointed three judges for each court for life or during good behavior—21 judges in all outside of the District of Columbia—every one of whom was placed beyond the power of the new Government under Jefferson that had been selected by the people to succeed the Federalists. Among the midnight appointments which Adams made were 42 magistrates for the District of Columbia, all of whom were to hold their offices for a period beyond that for which the President himself had been elected.

Adams sent the nominations to the Senate on the 2d of March. They were confirmed during the night of the 3d and Jefferson found them on the table in the Department of State the next morning. The commissions had not been delivered. Jefferson held that delivery was necessary to make them effective,

and at once directed Madison, his Secretary of State, to destroy them.

Jefferson's course in refusing to sanction the appointments made by Adams furnished the desired opportunity to the Federalists to institute proceedings for mandamus to compel Madison to deliver the commissions. Out of this controversy grew the celebrated case of *Marbury v. Madison* (1 Cranch, U. S. Reports, 137).

The judges of the Supreme Court were all Federalists and the Chief Justice was none other than President Jefferson's old-time political enemy, John Marshall, the ablest judge that ever occupied a seat upon the bench of the Supreme Court. No man perhaps was ever more strictly just or legally honest; but he entertained during his whole public life as a Member of Congress, Secretary of War, Secretary of State, and supreme judge Federal principles and prejudices of the most intense character, and consequently no man in the Nation better equipped to carry out Hamilton's ideas of government could have been found.

Jefferson was advised that steps would be taken by the friends of Adams to compel him to deliver the commissions to the judges who had been appointed, and he at once took measures to defend and maintain the dignity of the Executive Department of the Government. Madison, as Secretary of State, was advised not to make himself a party to any act which could be construed as a recognition of the authority of the judicial branch of the Government to meddle in the affair.

Hamilton directed a motion to be entered at the December term of the Supreme Court, asking for a rule on Madison to show cause why a writ of mandamus should not issue commanding him to deliver the commissions to the judges, whom Adams had nominated.

Notice of the motion was served on Madison, but he paid no attention to the matter and refused to appear in court. He also declined to answer any questions relative to the commissions, and did not in any manner recognize the right or power of the court to hear the questions involved, much less to pass judgment upon them.

The Supreme Court, however, with John Marshall as Chief Justice, proceeded to hold an "ex parte" hearing.

Three questions were presented for the consideration of the court: First, could the Supreme Court award the writ of mandamus in any case; Second, would the writ lie to a Secretary of State in any case whatever; Third, could the Supreme Court in the present case award a writ of mandamus to James Madison, Secretary of State?

Of course, every lawyer will now admit the very first question to have been determined was the question of jurisdiction. Did the Supreme Court have jurisdiction to hear and determine the case?

If the court determines that it is without jurisdiction to hear the case, then it should not attempt a hearing on the merits, and much less should the court attempt to render a decision on the merits.

Under the Constitution it was evident that the Supreme Court was without jurisdiction to try the case, and such was finally the unanimous opinion of the court; but Marshall reversed the order of consideration of the points involved in the case and actually wrote an opinion on the merits, in which he attempted to show that withholding the commissions was an act unwarranted by law and was a violation of a vested legal right, and then concluded by holding that the Supreme Court had no jurisdiction of the subject and no right to grant the writ of mandamus. The course pursued by Marshall in that case and sanctioned by all the associate judges was most exceptional and absolutely without precedent in English or American law. Under the Constitution it was certain that the court had no original jurisdiction of the subject matter and could not under any state of facts grant the writ of mandamus. Why, then, render a decision on the merits?

A decision on the merits, followed by a denial of the writ for want of jurisdiction, could have had no other purpose than to indicate to the courts of inferior jurisdiction what the Supreme Court would do if such a case was brought before it on appeal. The hearing had been "ex parte," and that was an additional reason for a determination of the question of jurisdiction without touching the merits. The truth is borne out by subsequent history—that the case of *Marbury* against Madison was a political legal battle between the Federalist and the anti-Federalist idea of government, with Marshall and Jefferson acting as the chief exponents of the contending political thought of the age.

It was the first inroad of the judicial branch of the Government on the power of the executive department, and it laid the foundation for a judicial superstructure that has become an

actual menace to the legislative and executive departments of the Government in State and Nation.

Hamilton, Marshall, and Adams foresaw the great power of the judicial department of the Government under such an interpretation of the Constitution as was laid down in the Marbury case, and knew it could not be checked by the people, for under the Constitution the people could not reach the judges.

The doctrine of the recall of judicial decisions and the limitation of the power of the judiciary found advocates then and there.

In the great fight of President Jackson against the Bank of the United States we see again a feeble effort to limit the controlling influence of the judiciary over the other departments of the Government in regard to questions of constitutional power. Andrew Jackson argued that the division of the powers of the Federal Government into distinct and independent departments was founded on well-established principles of tremendous importance to the welfare of the Nation, and his bank veto message contained the following language:

If the opinion of the Supreme Court covered the whole ground of this act, it ought not to control the coordinate authorities of the Government. The Congress, the Executive, and the Court must each for itself be guided by its own opinion of the Constitution. Each public officer who takes an oath to support the Constitution swears that he will support it as he understands it and not as it is understood by others.

It is as much the duty of the House of Representatives, of the Senate, and of the President to decide upon the constitutionality of any bill or resolution which may be presented to them for passage or approval as it is of the supreme judges when it may be brought before them for judicial decision.

The opinion of the judges has no more authority over Congress than the opinion of Congress has over the judges, and on that point the President is independent of both. The authority of the Supreme Court must not, therefore, be permitted to control the Congress or the Executive when acting in their legislative capacities, but to have only such influence as the force of their reasoning may deserve.

While we can not agree with all the reasoning of President Jackson in this declaration, it is nevertheless a notable fact that Webster assented to most of it, although bitterly opposing Jackson on his bank policy. Webster said:

It is true that each branch of the legislature has an undoubted right in the exercise of its functions to consider the constitutionality of a law proposed to be passed. This is naturally a part of its duty, and neither branch can be compelled to pass any law or do any other act which it deems to be beyond the reach of its constitutional power. The President has the same right when a bill is presented for his approval, for he is doubtless bound to consider in all cases whether such bill be compatible with the Constitution and whether he can approve it consistently with his oath of office.

Webster, however, concluded, with great force and power, that the Constitution had constituted the Supreme Court a tribunal to decide great constitutional questions, and that when the Court had decided such a question it was forever put at rest, and that every department of the Government must acquiesce. This was Hamilton's idea, and it was the principle sought to be established by Marshall in the Marbury case. The continued growth and development of this power of the judiciary has resulted in judicial legislation and a consequent demand by the people for a limitation of the powers of the judicial branch of the Government.

Senator White, in answering Webster, contended that the Constitution vests the judicial power in a Supreme Court and such inferior courts as Congress may from time to time ordain and establish, and that whenever a suit is commenced and prosecuted in the courts of the United States, of which they have jurisdiction, and such suit is decided by the Supreme Court—as that is the court of last resort—its decision is final and conclusive between the parties. But as an authority it does not bind either the Congress or the President of the United States. He argued that if either of these coordinate departments is afterwards called upon to perform an official act, and believes the performance of that act will be a violation of the Constitution, they are not bound to perform it, but, on the contrary, are as much at liberty to decline acting as if no such decision had been made. He declared that—

If different interpretations are put upon the Constitution by the different departments of the Government, the people is the tribunal to settle the dispute. Each of the departments—executive, legislative, and judicial—is the agent of the people, doing their business according to the powers conferred; and where there is a disagreement as to the extent of these powers, the people themselves through the ballot boxes must settle it.

This is the true view of the Constitution. Beyond question it is the construction which those who framed and adopted it placed upon it. It was the origin of the doctrine of the recall of judicial decision by the people.

The more carefully the questions involved are examined the more apparent becomes the dangers to the well-being and the liberties of our people of the principle under which it is claimed that the judicial branch of our Government has a controlling power over the other departments of the Government relative to constitutional questions.

I contend that nowhere in the Constitution of the United States is the Supreme Court expressly authorized to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional. When it was proposed in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 to give the Supreme Court of the Nation a limited veto upon Congress, the convention refused four different times to permit it.

The Supreme Court for years claimed no such power and made no attempt to exercise it. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Supreme Court is the greatest court in the world. It enjoys jurisdiction and power not claimed by the supreme tribunal of any other nation on the globe. Such a court would not be tolerated in England, France, or Germany. When the legislative bodies of those nations enact a law no court can unmake that law. Measured by its tremendous power, our Supreme Court is unrivaled.

John Marshall, by his interpretation of our Constitution, made the Supreme Court of the United States the most powerful branch of our Government.

He was the Chief Justice of a court that Jefferson said was "advancing its noiseless steps like a thief over the field of jurisdiction," and yet Marshall as a lawyer in earlier years when arguing a case before the Supreme Court, in which the Virginia sequestration act was attacked as unconstitutional, used this remarkable language:

The legislative authority of any country can only be restrained by its own municipal constitution. This is a principle that springs from the very nature of society, and the judicial authority can have no right to question the validity of a law unless such jurisdiction is expressly given by the Constitution.

The recall of judicial decisions is condemned by its enemies without rhyme or reason. Some men say it would lead to anarchy; that it is a new-fangled idea of Theodore Roosevelt, and, like all other theories of government advanced by Roosevelt and the Progressive Party, is inimical to the liberties of the people regulated by law. Harvey, who discovered the circulation of the blood in the human body, was almost burned at the stake by the enemies of human progress.

The direct primary, the initiative, the referendum, the recall, equal suffrage, and the short ballot have been and still are bitterly fought by the enemies of progress in government, by the men who fear the people, and yet those theories of government are as certain to become the practical means by which our people are to be governed as it is certain that our blood does circulate through our bodies.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, ridicule and unfair criticism will not answer the demand for the recall of judges or of judicial decisions.

Years after the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian contests for power between departments of the Government had ended, the doctrine of complete immunity from criticism of our courts took root and flourished until undeniable evils crept into the system and such outrageous wrongs were perpetrated by our courts in the name of justice that the people reluctantly came to believe the charge that their highest courts were influenced by great corporations and special interests. So many concrete examples and specific instances of laws being declared unconstitutional by our courts came to public notice that many men believed the supreme judges of our State and Federal courts were usurping powers that threatened the well-being of the people.

This usurpation has taken two forms: First, an attempt not merely to interpret the law, but to legislate; and, second, the exercise of the veto power on the lawmaking body—the too frequent exercise of the power to declare laws enacted by Congress and State legislatures unconstitutional and void. The solemn truth is we have too many courts and too much judge-made law. [Applause.]

It requires as much heart and brain for a judge to decide the fate of a poor devil charged with the theft of a loaf of bread as it does to determine what shall be done with the millionaire thief, whose manipulations of watered stocks have brought anguish and ruin to many homes.

The right of appeal is much too broad, and our legal procedure in nearly all our States is nothing less than an abomination.

The right to demur, to file special pleas and additional counts, the rebutter and the surrebutter have filled our reports with worthless technicalities and has cost litigants millions of dollars, for which they have received nothing, unless it was the knowledge that their lawyers were being educated in the intricacies and sophistries of technical pleading. Under our present judicial system a man of wealth and a cunning lawyer can delay the plainest and most simple lawsuit until the pocket and the patience of a poor man are exhausted.

A judge of the supreme court of one of our States, in a recent address, said:

Our laws are inadequate. They do not satisfy the popular conception of equal justice. The people clamor against the law, its delays, its discriminations, its inconsistencies; and with much reason. Something will happen. Unless judges will act, the people will act. If they do not resort to the recall, they will revise the Constitution; they will create new courts—courts to do rough justice, courts to do summary justice, courts close to the common people, courts without technicalities, sophistries, and delays, where substantial right prevails.

Mr. Taft said:

Of all the questions that are before the American people I regard no one as more important than this: The improvement of the administration of justice. We must make it so that the poor man will have, as nearly as possible, an equal opportunity in litigating as the rich man; and under present conditions, ashamed as we may be of it, this is not the fact.

Judge Clark, of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, has said that—

At the present time the supreme power is not in the hands of the people, but in the power of the judges, who can set aside at will any expression of the people's will made through an act of Congress or a State legislature. These judges are not chosen by the people nor subject to review by them. This is arbitrary power and the corporations have taken possession of it simply by naming a majority of the judges.

Mr. Speaker, this is strong language. Is it surprising that men in the shop and in the field should distrust our courts under these circumstances? And is it remarkable that the people should demand a change in the system? Let us examine the record more carefully and ascertain, if possible, whether or not there is any just cause for the recall of judicial decisions.

In 1884 the legislature of the State of New York passed an act entitled "An act to improve the public health by prohibiting the manufacture of cigars and the preparation of tobaccos in any form in tenement houses in certain cases." The New York court of appeals held the law unconstitutional. This decision, in effect, said to the people of New York, "You can not pass laws to safeguard the health and the lives of the citizens of your State where a question of property right is involved."

Gov. Aldrich, of Nebraska, in speaking of the decision in the well-known Minnesota rate case, said:

When any court, whether it be the United States Supreme Court or a court of inferior jurisdiction, continually makes effort by judicial decision to do that which the people and the people alone have a right to do, then I say that such a court is seeking to establish judicial tyranny. And if allowed to proceed unchallenged along the line of this unwarranted assumption of power, representative government will simply be that in name only.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Yes.

Mr. DIES. I should like to ask the gentleman who made the constitution of the State of New York, that he seems to think the courts ought not to protect the people in the enforcement of?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Who made the constitution?

Mr. DIES. Who made the constitution of the State of New York, that the court was upholding for the people?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. It should have been made by the representatives of the people.

Mr. DIES. Well, who made it?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I do not know. I was not there. Perhaps the gentleman can tell me who made it.

Mr. DIES. The people make all constitutions. Every constitution of a free State of this Union is made by the sovereign people of that State.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I presume the people made it. They should have made it through their representatives.

Mr. DIES. Then the courts of New York merely sustained the people in upholding their organic law.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I do not consider that the gentleman has asked me a question that I am to answer any further than I have answered it.

About 10 years ago the legislature of New York passed a law limiting the hours of labor in bakeries in that State in the interest of the health and lives of its citizens engaged in that work. The law had been given intelligent consideration by the members of the State legislature. It had been approved by the governor and sustained by the highest court of the State of New York, and yet in the case of *Lochner v. New York*, One hundred and ninety-eighth United States Reports, page 45, a divided court, five out of nine judges, declared that the law was unconstitutional.

Mr. Justice Harlan in a dissenting opinion said:

If there be doubt as to the validity of the statute, that doubt must therefore be resolved in favor of its validity, and the courts must keep their hands off, leaving the legislature to meet the responsibility for unwise legislation.

But the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Holmes strikes the very heart of the matter when he says:

This case is decided upon an economic theory which a large part of the country does not entertain. If it were a question whether I agree

with that theory (limiting the consecutive hours of labor in bakeries which may be required of an employee), I should desire to study it further and long before making up my mind. But I do not conceive that to be my duty, because I strongly believe that my agreement or disagreement has nothing to do with the right of a majority to embody their opinions in law.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I yield for a question.

Mr. DIES. I understand the gentleman wants the Constitution of the United States enforced and interpreted; and since the Supreme Court is not to interpret it, according to the gentleman's statement, who is to interpret the written Constitution of the United States?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. If the gentleman will wait a few moments, I think I will answer that in my speech.

Mr. DIES. I am waiting patiently.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Is there not just a gentle hint here that, perhaps the majority of the court did not believe in the economic theory contained in the statute, and for that reason declared the act unconstitutional? In 1906 Congress passed an act, which was approved by the President, known as the employees' liability act. This law made common carriers engaged in interstate commerce liable for all damages resulting from the negligence of its officers, agents, or employees, or by reason of any defects, results from negligence in the cars, machinery, roadbed, and so forth. The Supreme Court, by a vote of 5 to 4, held this statute unconstitutional.

In August, 1894, Congress passed an income-tax law, which, in substance, provided for a tax of 2 per cent on net incomes above \$4,000.

A man named Charles Pollock, a stockholder in the Farmers' Loan & Trust Co. of New York, brought an action to restrain or enjoin the collection of the tax, claiming that the law was unconstitutional.

When the first argument was made in the Supreme Court in March, 1895, Mr. Justice Jackson, on account of illness, took no part in the case. The lower court had held the act constitutional. The eight members of the court were equally divided on all questions involved in the constitutionality of the act with the single exception of the provision which imposed a tax upon rents and incomes from real estate. When the case was reargued Justice Jackson was present and voted to sustain the law, but for some reason one of the judges who at first had been in favor of sustaining the law changed his vote and the law was annihilated.

Justice Field, in his opinion declaring this law unconstitutional, said:

The present assault upon capital is but the beginning. It will be but the stepping-stone to others larger and more sweeping till our political contests will become a war of the poor against the rich.

Judge Clark, of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, in speaking of this decision, said:

One man nullified the action of Congress and the President and 75,000,000 living people. In 13 years that decision has taxed the property and labor of the country \$1,003,000,000, which Congress in compliance with the public will, and relying upon previous decisions of the court, had decreed should be paid out of the excessive incomes of the rich.

Justice Jackson, in a dissenting opinion, said:

The decision (of the majority of the court) disregards the well-established canon of construction that an act passed by a coordinate branch of the Government has every presumption in its favor, and should never be declared invalid by the court unless its repugnancy to the Constitution is clear beyond all reasonable doubt.

And Justice Brown said:

While I have no doubt that Congress will find some means of surmounting the present crisis, my fear is that in some moment of national peril this decision will rise up to frustrate its will and paralyze its arm.

No matter which side of this controversy we may take, it is evident to any sensible man, from opinions of the judges which I have quoted, that the real question which controlled the court was the expediency or propriety of the income-tax law, and not whether it was in conflict with the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, it is because of the growing belief that our courts declare laws unconstitutional, because they do not believe in the principle or economic ideas embodied in them rather than because they are in conflict with the Constitution, that the doctrine of recall of judges and judicial decisions has found a permanent place in the minds of our people.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I wish to refer briefly to two more decisions, *The Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward* (4 Wheat., 517) and the case of *Fletcher v. Peck* (6 Cr., 87).

The Dartmouth College case was a great victory for the Federalists, but it was much more than that, for it established the doctrine that every charter, franchise, and privilege which any corporation could secure from a legislature was a contract and could not be impaired in any way by subsequent legislation.

Chancellor Kent, speaking with approval of the Dartmouth case, for he was an intense Federalist, said:

The decision in that case did more than any other single act proceeding from the authority of the United States, to throw an impregnable barrier around all rights and franchises derived from the grant of government.

And 50 years later Judge Cole, of the Iowa Supreme Court, said:

The practical effect of the Dartmouth College decision is to exalt the rights of the few above those of the many; and it is doubtless true that under the authority of that decision more monopolies have been created and perpetuated and more wrongs and outrages upon the people affected than by any other single instrumentality in the Government. (See *Dubuque v. Rachard*, A., 33 Iowa, 95.)

Mr. BARTLETT. May I say to the gentleman that it is a fact that the Dartmouth College case led every State in the Union, I believe, either to put in its constitution a prohibition against the granting of charters that were irrevocable, or to the putting into the act granting a charter to a corporation of the reservation of the right to alter, amend, or repeal?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. So that the decision in the Dartmouth College case is no longer law, either in the States or in the Nation.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. That is true. Under the rule laid down in the Fletcher case a charter or franchise procured by fraud can not be invalidated, no matter how brazen the fraud. Mr. Chairman, in view of all these things can we pretend surprise that the people should follow Theodore Roosevelt when he says:

I urge that in such cases, where the courts construe the Constitution as if property rights had a first mortgage on the Constitution, to the exclusion of human rights, the people, after careful deliberation, be given the right to vote and finally determine whether the law which was set aside shall be valid or not.

Mr. DIES. I should be glad to have a distinction drawn between human rights and property rights, if the gentleman will so favor us.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. If the gentleman can not draw a distinction between a human life and a mile of Pennsylvania Railroad track, why, I must confess that I fear I could not enlighten him.

Mr. DIES. I did not say human life. I said the distinction between human rights and property rights.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. It is common knowledge that the people have nothing to do with the appointment of a Federal judge or his retention in office; and it is just as generally understood that most Federal judges are nominated and appointed through the influence of special interests. Why should not the people, whose servants the judges are supposed to be, have power to recall them, and also their decisions, when those decisions are in conflict with a public need and a righteous public demand? Do you say the people will make mistakes in attempting to secure control of their judicial servants by means of the recall? I answer that throughout all history that same argument has been made against every attempt of the people to acquire some share in their government. Let the agents of special interests argue and protest as they may, the stubborn fact remains that the people intend to take such steps as may be necessary to compel the courts to serve the interests of the whole people, as was the original intent of the Constitution.

We have recently decided that United States Senators shall be elected by the people. The judges of our State supreme courts are elected by the people. Why should powerful special interests have the right to influence the appointment of Federal judges and the people, whose servants they are, be powerless to reach them or their decisions? [Applause.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 18 minutes.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will my colleague yield for an interruption?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I will yield for a question, although I would like to save the time for somebody else. I reserve my time unless the question the gentleman wants to ask is an important one.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to ask a rather important question. We understand, of course, that all citizens stand on an equality before the law and the courts, the poor man as well as the great corporation. Now, the point I would like to have my colleague make plain to me, if possible, is this: In the case of the recall of judicial decisions does he believe that the poor and unfortunate of whom he has spoken in his excellent address would have an equal opportunity before the people in a contest with the powerful interests in the country that could use every

means of advertising and carrying on a campaign in the interest of the recall of a decision that might be against them?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I will answer that by saying that while the poor are always handicapped in a battle against the rich, still they would avail themselves of the opportunity to register their will, whereas under the present system they can not be heard at all.

Mr. McKENZIE. The point I am trying to have the gentleman make clear is—

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I do not concede, however, if the gentleman will pardon me, that before the law as it now exists, and under the present method of procedure in the most of the States, the poor man is on an equality with the rich man in our courts by any means.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman has stated a few instances of where the court may be in error, but is it not true that in the thousands and thousands of cases that have been decided by the courts in the country but little criticism has been made?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Undoubtedly that is so.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Yes; but I would like to reserve the balance of my time for my colleagues.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will take but a moment. Does not the gentleman think that the recall of judicial decisions would lead to the utter confusion of legal principles? For instance, under a certain state of facts there might be involved a certain legal principle, which, when submitted to the people, might receive favorable action. Under an entirely different state of facts, with the same legal principle involved, a totally different result might be reached when submitted to the popular vote. The same legal principle might thus be pronounced constitutional at one election and unconstitutional at another. Does not the gentleman think it would lead to great confusion of legal principles?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. No; I do not think it would any more than a question of public policy would if submitted to the people. I would like to add that it would not lead to any more confusion or hardship than the fact that more than one-half of the decisions rendered by the supreme courts on questions between litigants are decided, not upon the merits of the case in which the litigant is interested, but upon technical points of pleading for which the litigants pay and never know that the interests really involved in the case have been touched. In the State of Illinois one of the most eminent lawyers in the State has made the statement that out of 250 volumes of reports of decisions of the supreme court in that State the decisions on the actual merits of the cases could be put in one-third of the volumes; that the other two-thirds are decisions of the court on technical questions of pleading.

Mr. FITZHENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Yes.

Mr. FITZHENRY. I would like to clear up a point raised by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] referring to the Dartmouth College case not being the law in the United States on account of the State constitutions. In order that the gentleman's excellent speech may not be misinterpreted, I want to call attention to the fact that the Illinois constitution contains the provision prohibiting the making of an irrevocable grant or special privilege or immunity, and the Supreme Court of Illinois has held that that provision in the Bill of Rights or our Constitution applies to the legislature of a State, but that it does not apply to any of the agencies of the legislature. In other words, the legislature can not pass an act that will make an irrevocable grant or special privilege or immunity, but the Supreme Court of Illinois has held that a city council can do it.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I am glad to have that go into the Record. I ought to state that it was not my idea in making this presentation of the Dartmouth College case to have anyone draw the conclusion from that that it was now the law in the different States, or that the different States had not taken action to the contrary, but as tending to show the development of that idea in our judicial system. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I will be recognized in my own time. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITZHENRY] a question. Does not the city in Illinois get its charter from the legislature?

Mr. FITZHENRY. They do.

Mr. BARTLETT. Could not the legislature prohibit the city from granting an irrevocable charter or special privilege or immunity?

Mr. FITZHENRY. It does not, and the supreme court has held that the legislature can not make an irrevocable grant or special privilege or immunity.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 12 minutes.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I reserve the balance of that time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HAMMOND having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

House concurrent resolution 39.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That for the representation of the Congress at the exercises to be held at the navy yard in Brooklyn, N. Y., on Monday, May 11, 1914, in honor of the men of the Navy and Marine Corps who lost their lives at Vera Cruz, Mexico, there shall be appointed by the Vice President 7 Members of the United States Senate and by the Speaker 15 Members of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. That the expenses of the committee shall be defrayed in equal parts from the contingent appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

PENSIONS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the proverbial ingratitude of Republics surely can not be charged against ours by the soldiers of the country and their dependents when it is remembered that we have paid them in pensions since the Government was established the vast sum of \$4,500,000,000, aside from giving them nearly 69,000,000 acres of the public domain. Indeed, considering our population and resources and the size of our armies, it may be truthfully said that ours is the most liberal pension system of the world, notwithstanding the fact that it contains some inequalities and injustices, which I shall presently discuss. The legislative history of the evolution of that system, including the parts played in it by individuals and by parties, affords a most interesting illustration of political psychology and party expediency. I possess the somewhat unique status of one who has both an administrative and a legislative knowledge of the pension question, having had nearly a decade of training in the administration of the law and almost as long a period of service—part of the time as a member of the Invalid Pensions Committee—in a legislative body which deals almost constantly with the subject. I think, therefore, that I may be pardoned for assuming to speak with some authority.

Perhaps it would not be amiss for me to give at the outset a brief résumé of pension legislation. The Continental Congress, on the very threshold of our independence, realized what I regret to say some gentlemen do not seem to realize now—the unbounded debt we owe to the men who leave their homes and their families and endanger their health and lives in the hour of the country's peril.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, there was so much confusion I did not understand what the gentleman from Kentucky stated about his experience in pension matters. Did I understand him to say that he had had a good many years of experience in the executive branch of the pension work?

Mr. LANGLEY. I said that I had served in connection with the administration of the pension law for nearly 10 years.

Mr. DAVIS. What branch?

Mr. LANGLEY. I was an examiner in the Pension Bureau for over four years and a member of the Board of Pension Appeals for over five years.

CONTINENTAL CONGRESS.

One of the very first acts passed by that Congress, less than two months after the Declaration of Independence, was that of August 26, 1776, which promised half pay for life, or during disability, to every officer, soldier, sailor, marine, or seaman losing a limb in any engagement or becoming so disabled in the service as to render him incapable of earning a livelihood. Indeed, pensions were granted in this country long before the Declaration of Independence. While the first national pension law was the one to which I have just referred, many of the English colonies in America, early in the history of colonial legislation, provided for the relief of wounded and maimed soldiers.

PILGRIMS AT PLYMOUTH—FIRST PENSION LAW.

In 1636 the Pilgrims at Plymouth enacted in their courts that any man who should be sent forth as a soldier and returned maimed should be maintained competently by the colony during his life. According to history, this is the first pension law ever passed in America. Forty years later, in 1676, a standing committee of the General Court of Massachusetts Bay held regular meetings in "Boston town house" to hear the applications of wounded soldiers for relief; and after this colony was united

with Plymouth colony, under the charter of 1691, the province continued to make provision for the relief of disabled soldiers out of the public treasury. In 1644 the Virginia Assembly passed a disability pension law, and later it made provision for the relief of the indigent families of soldiers who were slain. Similar acts are found in the colonial statutes of Maryland and New York in the latter part of the seventeenth century. The colony of Rhode Island, in 1718, enacted a pension law which provided that every officer, soldier, or sailor employed in its service who should be disabled, by loss of limb or otherwise, for getting a livelihood for himself and family, or other dependent relatives, should have his wounds carefully looked after and healed at the colony's charge, and should have an annual pension for the maintenance of himself and family or other dependent relatives. This law further provided that if any person who had the charge of maintaining a wife, children, parents, or other relatives should be slain in the colony's military service, these relatives should be maintained while unable to provide for themselves.

Thus it will be seen that the custom of pensioning soldiers and sailors is not only as old as the English settlement on this continent, but that in some respects it went even further in the direction of liberality than the pension law of to-day.

BOUNTY LAND.

The same is true with regard to bounty-land legislation. From the earliest era of our history the policy of rewarding the defenders of the country by land bounties was marked with great liberality. Land bounties were even promised before the Nation possessed any public domain. Many instances are recorded of grants by the colonies before our independence. Enormous grants were made by the colonies of North Carolina and Virginia to that intrepid Yankee, Gen. Nathanael Greene, who became such an idol of the southern people. Gen. Lafayette was granted for his services and sacrifices the sum of \$200,000 and one township of public lands, or about 23,000 acres, to be located by the President, which, however, as is well known, Gen. Lafayette declined to accept. A liberal annuity, payable semiannually, was also granted to the widow and each child, by name, of Commodore Perry.

The Continental Congress by resolution of September 16, 1776, provided a regularly graduated scale of land grants for service in the Revolutionary War, ranging from 800 acres for a colonel to 100 acres for a private. Later a major general was given 1,100 acres and a brigadier general 850 acres. Similar laws were passed for service in the War of 1812, Mexican War, and the various Indian wars, but no land grants have been made for service subsequent to 1855, legislation since that time giving preference to the country's defenders in connection with the public domain having been confined to the matter of shortening to the extent of the length of service the period of residence required to acquire a homestead, a minimum residence of one year being required in all cases, however. All these rights in connection with the public domain, it may be added, were also extended to the widow and other relatives practically in the same manner as title to pension is provided in the pension laws.

FIRST NATIONAL LAW PENSIONING WIDOWS AND ORPHANS.

The first national pension law in behalf of widows and orphans was the resolution of August 24, 1780, which extended to widows and orphan children the half-pay provision provided in the act of August 26, 1776, for officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines in cases where death was due to the service, although Margaret Corbin, a widow of a Revolutionary soldier, had been previously pensioned by the resolution of Congress passed July 6, 1779. This case is such an unusual and interesting one that I shall take the time of the committee to read the resolution by which that pension was given to her. It is taken from the Journals of the Continental Congress, and is as follows:

Resolved, That Margaret Corbin, who was wounded and disabled in the attack on Fort Mifflin, whilst she heroically filled the post of her husband who was killed by her side serving a piece of artillery, do receive, during her natural life, or the continuance of the said disability, the one-half of the monthly pay drawn by a soldier in the service of the States; and that she now receive out of the public stores one complete suit of cloaths, or the value thereof in money.

On July 25 of the following year another resolution was passed for her relief, which read as follows:

Resolved, That Margaret Corbin receive annually, during her natural life, one complete suit of cloaths out of the public stores, or the value thereof in money, in addition to the provision made for her by the act of Congress of July 6, 1779.

I mention these instances of the people's patriotic liberality in the early days of the Republic toward its defenders and their

dependents with the hope that they may teach a lesson to those gentlemen of to-day who are constantly inveighing against our present liberal pension system.

Congress from time to time passed laws for the relief of soldiers, sailors, and marines and their widows and orphans following the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the various Indian wars in which the country was engaged prior to the beginning of the Civil War, and our pension system gradually grew more liberal during that period, although it is interesting to note the fact that a longer period of time elapsed after these wars before such relief was granted than was the case following the War of the Revolution.

THE CIVIL WAR.

The pension laws of the country did not, of course, assume very large proportions until the Civil War. This was necessarily true because of the enormous number of participants in that war as compared with previous wars. The act of July 22, 1861, authorizing the employment of volunteers to aid in enforcing the laws and protecting public property promised to those who were disabled in that service the same benefits that had been or might thereafter be conferred on persons disabled in the regular service, and to the widow and legal heirs of those who died or were killed in the service the sum of \$100, "in addition to all arrears of pay and allowances." This was followed by the comprehensive act of July 14, 1862, which is the foundation of our present pension system. This act reenacted the provisions of the act of July 22, 1861, and specified the rates of pension for officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines disabled by reason of wounds received or diseases contracted in the service of the United States and in the line of duty.

These provisions were gradually broadened and liberalized by various subsequent enactments until the beneficiaries became entitled to rates varying from six to one hundred dollars a month, dependent upon the nature and extent of disability. That act also provided pension for the widow and minor children and in the absence of these for the dependent mother, father, orphan sisters and brothers, in the order named, where the death of the soldier, sailor, or marine was the result of his service. This is the first act that conferred a pensionable status upon dependent parents, sisters, and brothers. It may also be noted here that prior to the Civil War there never was any provision of law giving pensions to widows in cases where the death of the husband was due to his service in time of peace. All of the prior enactments for the relief of widows and orphans were confined to cases where death resulted from service during a war. This act of July 14, 1862, fixed the rate of pension for all of these dependent classes at the rate allowed invalids for total disability, which was \$8 a month, except the higher rates provided for officers. The \$2 additional for each minor child of the soldier under 16 years of age was added to the widow's pension by an act passed subsequent to the war, which became effective July 25, 1866. The rate of pension to the widow and to the minor children and dependent relatives in all cases, in which the act of July 14, 1862, limited it to \$8 a month, was increased to \$12 a month by the act of March 19, 1886. Pension for widows and minor children where the death of the husband was not due to his service was first provided in the act of June 27, 1890, which fixed the rate at \$8 a month. This was increased to \$12 by the act of April 19, 1903, the present law. A law has never been enacted granting a pension to dependent relatives other than widows and minor children unless death was due to the service.

FIRST GENERAL ACT FOR SERVICE ONLY.

The act of March 18, 1818, was the first general act passed which granted pension for service only, and it required proof that the beneficiaries were in indigent circumstances and in need of assistance. There were several later service-pension acts for participants in the earlier wars, but it was 25 years after the close of the Civil War before Congress departed from the rule that a pension for the participants in that war must be confined to disability of service origin. This was done by the act of June 27, 1890, which fixed the minimum pension at \$6 and the maximum at \$12 a month, regardless of rank, requiring proof only of inability to perform manual labor and without showing that the disability was of service origin. This was also a service pension in that a minimum service of 90 days was required.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Has the gentleman any figures or information as to how pensions ranged in the early history of the country with pensions that are granted now?

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman means the rates of pension then as compared with the rates of pension now?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I should say that the rates of pension now, as a whole, are more liberal than they were in the earlier days of our history to which I have been referring, especially for disability contracted in service. There was not much difference as between different periods prior to the Civil War, but since then the rates have gradually grown more liberal. On the other hand, there was more liberality toward them in the earlier period with respect to the public domain, as I shall presently show.

AGE LAW.

The next important step in pension legislation was the act of February 6, 1907, known as the age law. The benefits of this act were confined to those who rendered the service. It was in fact both an age and a service pension act, because it fixed certain specific rates for certain ages and as in the act of 1890 a minimum service of 90 days was required. There was quite a division of sentiment in Congress on the question as to whether age or length of service should be the chief factor in fixing the rates of pension. This finally culminated in the enactment of the act of May 11, 1912, known as the Sherwood law, which was a compromise between the age and the service proponents, the act fixing rates which are governed both by age and by length of service.

Such in brief is what this Republic has done for its defenders and their dependents.

It is a splendid exhibit of the patriotism and generosity of a grateful people. I beg your indulgence now for a few moments while I discuss briefly the political history of this legislation. I earnestly desire that what I say may not be misunderstood. I speak with the utmost candor when I tell you that it always grieves me to hear the statement or the insinuation, in this body or out of it, that the thought uppermost in the minds of sworn public officials, as we are, who are dependent upon votes for retention in our places, or for advancement, as we are, is not what our duty is or what the right of the matter may be, but rather what is the most popular and calculated to get us the most votes. I undertake to say that there does not exist to-day a more insidious or a more dangerous enemy of the Republic than that sort of an estimate of public men, and I fear that it is not only too prevalent to-day for the good of the country, but that it is constantly growing. And, gentlemen, we are in a measure responsible for it ourselves—sometimes by merely indulging in a friendly and designedly harmless colloquy with each other and sometimes with sinister purpose. I share to an enthusiastic degree the estimate which our distinguished Speaker places upon the personnel of this body. It was my privilege as a public servant in an executive branch of the Government service to form the personal acquaintance of a majority of the Members of both branches of Congress, and during my service of nearly eight years here that acquaintance has necessarily been widened. I think I have had as good an opportunity as the average among you to know and to understand the motives of these men who are here earnestly toiling for the people who have honored them.

I am proud of the privilege of saying that I do not think I have come in contact with a single Member on either side of the House of any political party concerning whose honorable and patriotic purposes I have entertained the slightest doubt. I must admit that I have seen one once in awhile who was possessed of rather curious angles of vision, but they were always honest angles. I think, gentlemen, that if we were a little more just and a little more tolerant toward each other it would be better for us all and better for the country. So much by way of introduction to what I am now going to say on the political side of pension legislation. I shall endeavor to discuss it dispassionately, relying upon the cold facts of history to establish what I assert. I want to be fair to both sides. If there is one among us who can not appreciate the other fellow's side of a question, it is unfortunate that he was not broadened a little before he achieved the high honor of membership in this body.

DEMOCRATIC ANTIPATHY.

I am keeping in mind what I have just said when I make the assertion that the uniform, consistent, and unswerving course of the Republican Party has been in favor of liberal pension laws, and that since the Civil War the traditional, historical, and natural attitude of the Democratic Party as a party has been antagonistic to such laws.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman does not think that applies to the Democratic majority of this House or of the last Congress?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will wait a few minutes, I think I will enlighten him on that very point. I think it does, to a large extent. I am coming to that directly.

I shall endeavor to show why this has been logically and necessarily true—the natural outgrowth of existing conditions and the inevitable result of human sympathies and passions. For many years succeeding the Civil War Congress in both branches consisted of men who had either participated in that war or whose opinions and sentiments were still strong on one side or the other. Naturally, therefore, the attitude of parties and of individuals on the subject of pensions—a subject so closely related to that conflict—was pronounced and well defined.

The bulk of the Republican membership, which was in the majority, came almost entirely from sections of the country that were loyal to the Union. A pension was a recognition of loyal service, and of necessity was originated and supported by Republicans. It is true that a very small minority of the Democrats, reflecting their individual sentiments, voted for these measures, but these did not reflect the sentiments of their party organization. This is conclusively evidenced by the fact that on 15 important pension measures passed between the close of the Civil War and 1890 every Republican vote, 1,068 in number, was cast for these bills and not a single Republican vote cast against them; while, on the other hand, there were 648 Democratic votes cast against them and only 417 votes for them. There was another incident during this period which corroborates the statement I have made regarding the attitude of the two parties on this question. The Forty-ninth Congress was Democratic in both branches and there was a Democratic President. The Hon. Courtland C. Matson, a northern Democrat, was chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House. He brought in a dependent pension bill similar in its provisions to the act of June 27, 1890, enacted some three and one-half years later. This bill passed both Houses. Not a single Republican voted against it, the only votes that were cast against it having been cast by Democrats. President Cleveland vetoed the bill. An effort was made to pass it over the President's veto. Every Republican supported that effort, but enough Democrats voted the other way to sustain the veto, and the bill failed. When the Republicans regained control of Congress and the Presidency the act of June 27, 1890, was passed and signed by a Republican President.

The sad thought in that connection is that as a result of the delay in the enactment of that beneficent law many old soldiers and their widows suffered for the necessities of life and many others passed on to the great beyond without the recognition and assistance which the Republican Party would fain have given them and which they were denied by the action of a Democratic President and the votes of Democratic Congressmen. If I had the time, I would like to refer to the language, so unfriendly to the old soldiers, used by President Cleveland in some of his veto messages and to the many instances that came under my personal observation where their pensions were reduced and many cut off entirely as a result of the rigid and unfriendly administration of the law during his incumbency of the Presidency. Suffice it to say that thousands of veterans still living remember all about that, and they remember, too, that these pension vetoes always emanated from the pen of a Democratic President.

After the failure of the Matson bill there was more discussion throughout the country on the pension question than had occurred in any previous period of the country's history. President Cleveland's veto aroused much criticism of him and his party. Grand Army posts all over the country took the matter up, and the question of the enactment of some additional relief for the veterans of the Civil War was fully discussed at its next national encampment. The matter figured extensively in the presidential election of 1888, and the attention of voters of all parties was sharply drawn to it. The vote in Congress on the act which was passed at the next session—act of 1890—is therefore quite significant. On the roll call on the original bill in the Senate, where the measure originated, not a single Republican vote was cast against it, while only 10 Democrats voted for it. On the roll call in the House not a single Republican voted against it, while only 38 Democrats voted for it. There were 71 Democratic votes cast against it, a majority of nearly two to one of that party in the negative. The Democratic vote in the Senate on the conference report was 3 ayes and 18 noes, while every Republican Senator who was present voted "aye." The vote in the House on the conference report was equally

pronounced. Only 28 Democrats voted "aye," while 56, exactly two to one of those voting, were recorded against it. On the other hand, every Republican vote cast, 117 in number, was in the affirmative. There was no record vote in either House on the passage of the act of February 6, 1907, but the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows clearly that the opposition to the measure in both Houses came from Democratic sources.

Meanwhile, the veterans of the Civil War were getting well advanced in years and less able to provide for themselves, while the cost of living was constantly increasing. As a result the conviction grew stronger and stronger, both in and out of Congress, that some additional relief should be given them. In the congressional elections of 1910 this question was made one of the leading issues, particularly in the northern and border States. It is well known to those of us who are familiar with the history of that campaign that the Republican Party lost many thousands of votes because of the prevalent opinion among many veterans of the Civil War and their relatives and friends that the Republican Party, then dominant in both the legislative and executive branches of the Government, had failed to preserve its previous record of being the special champion of these veterans in not giving them the relief which they needed. Whether there was any foundation for this I shall not stop here to discuss, except to say that, in view of all the Republican Party had done for them, I do not think they were justified in casting their votes for the party which had uniformly shown such unfriendliness to their cause.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this very thorough narrative history of pension legislation. The gentleman now speaks of the campaign of 1910, where the Republican Party was generally charged throughout the North with becoming a bit unfriendly to pension legislation. What I would ask the gentleman is this—and I am not sure whether I am right or not. Previous to 1910 was there not the appearance in Congress of Republican opposition to pension legislation, where it had not existed in the past?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, perhaps that was the first time that any Republican in Congress showed opposition to pension legislation. I am going to show presently and frankly admit that there were a few—I will not say misguided Republicans, but a few Republicans who ought to have known better—who opposed the legislation which was then proposed, but they were merely a drop in the bucket as compared with the compact, organized opposition of Democracy, through all those years, to pension legislation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it not also true that as that slight showing on the part of some Republicans in opposition to pension legislation appeared simultaneously the solid phalanx of the Democracy which opposed pensions in the past began to break, and a great many Democrats stood for pension legislation?

Mr. LANGLEY. That was the political psychology and party expediency to which I referred in the outset. That was one thing I had in mind when I used that language.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to say to the gentleman that I have been here a good many years, and I have never heard anyone give with completeness, such as he has, the history of pension legislation.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that compliment. I have devoted much time and thought to the subject. In the last session of the Sixty-first Congress a bill known as the Sulloway bill, which, like the preceding enactments, was both an age and a service bill, a minimum service of 90 days being required, and which granted a very liberal increase in the rates allowed these veterans, was reported by the Committee on Invalid Pensions and passed by the Republican House. There was not a record vote on that bill, either, in the House, and I am willing to concede that there was less Democratic opposition to it than had been manifested toward previous pension bills. It has been contended by you Democrats that the Republican Party was responsible for the failure of that bill to pass the Senate, because, forsooth, that body had a Republican majority then; and you were able to convince many voters of the country that that contention was just. I here and now deny, and I can produce the record to sustain that denial.

It is true that there were a few Republicans in the Senate who were not favorable to the bill, just as there were in the House, but there were several test votes which showed clearly that the bill would have passed the Senate but for the rules of procedure which made it impossible with the formidable opposition to it in that body, which opposition I shall show emanated almost entirely from the Democratic membership. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows repeated efforts of Republican

Senators to get the bill considered and passed and that these efforts were blocked by Democratic Senators. I ask you to look at page 2883 of the Record of February 18, 1911. Senator Scott, of West Virginia, a Republican, asked unanimous consent to take up the bill, and Senator OVERMAN, a Democrat, from North Carolina, objected. Thereupon Senator Scott moved to take up the bill notwithstanding the objection. There were 49 votes in favor of this motion, and 46 of them were Republicans; there were 35 votes against the motion, and 28 of them were cast by Democrats. The Record also shows that the action of the Democratic Senators prevented a final vote on the passage of the bill at that time. Again, on the 4th of March following (see pages 4320-4321 of the Record), the last day of the session, and the last chance the bill had to become a law in that Congress, a Republican Senator, Mr. Curtis, of Kansas, asked unanimous consent to take up the bill, and objection was made by Mr. GORE, a Democrat, from Oklahoma. A Republican Senator then moved to take it up notwithstanding this objection, and the vote on that motion showed practically the same political alignment as it did on the other occasion referred to, on February 18. I wish that every soldier in the country and their relatives and friends knew the exact truth about the entire procedure in connection with that bill.

But you Democrats say that these things are all in the past; that while it is true that in former years we were the friend and champion of the soldiers, we finally grew indifferent to their interests and that you are now their best friends; that you passed the Sherwood bill, which is more liberal than any bill we ever passed; and that in the future, if they expect anything more in the way of legislative and administrative favor, they must look to you and to your administration. Well, let us see about that. Let us examine the Record and see what it shows in connection with the passage of the Sherwood bill. You had 225 Democratic Members in the House at that time. You had a clear Democratic majority over all parties of 69. Keeping these figures in mind, I beg you to turn to pages 284 and 285 of the Record of the second session of the Sixty-second Congress. There you will find the roll call in the House on the passage of the original Sherwood bill. There were 229 votes cast in favor of it. Of these, 97 were Democrats, 1 Independent, 1 Socialist, and 130 Republicans. There were 93 votes cast against it, 90 of whom were Democrats. There were 6 who refused to vote and answered "present," all Democrats. There were 4 Republicans and 8 Democrats paired for the bill and 2 Republicans and 10 Democrats paired against it. In other words, counting the 8 Democrats paired in favor of the bill, you could only muster 105 out of your 225 Democratic votes in this House—less than half of them—who were willing to go on record as the friends of this measure; and I suspect from what I have heard since then that some of these afterwards wished that they had taken a different course.

Now, look at page 4015 of the Senate Record of the same session. There you will find the roll call on the House bill as amended in the Senate. Every Republican vote, 40 in all, was cast for the bill, while only 11 Democrats voted for it. There were 16 Democratic votes cast against it. There was no yeay-and-nay vote in the Senate on the adoption of the conference report, but there was in the House. It appears on page 6242 of the Record. There was no longer any question about the adoption of the conference report, and there was a comparatively small attendance that day, but an analysis of the vote does not help the cause of Democracy any in this connection. Of the 176 votes cast for the report only 77 were cast by Democrats, while of the 57 negative votes 56 were Democrats. The other negative vote was cast by the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT], of whose present political alignment I am not advised. Every Republican who was present and voted voted for the report. There were 98 of these.

What a "magnificent and unanswerable" exhibit in support of your contention that you of Democracy have become the residuary legatee of the honor which once belonged to the Republican Party of being the special friend and champion of the soldier! Really, gentlemen, you ought to be ashamed of yourselves for having the effrontery to make such a claim and expect people versed in the history of our country to believe it, when the record shows that at no time when you had control of Congress could you muster enough votes to pass a pension bill without the aid of Republicans, and when it also shows that the Sherwood bill, for which you claim so much credit, received less than 100 Democratic votes, when it took 193 votes to make a quorum of the House, and that if the real friends of the soldiers, the Republicans, had not rallied to the support of the bill, it would have been overwhelmingly defeated in the House of its alleged friends.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that while the House was Democratic the Senate was Republican and the President was Republican, and it was a Republican President who signed the bill?

Mr. LANGLEY. I am going to call attention to that in a moment in another connection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota to yield me 15 minutes more.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 minutes more.

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not know what foundation you have for the contention that the soldiers of the country must look to a Democratic administration for favorable consideration hereafter. Surely there is nothing in the record of previous Democratic administrations to base it on. As to what the present Democratic President may do I can not, of course, foretell. He has not had occasion to do anything since he has been President to show his attitude on the pension question. He did, however, express himself upon it some years ago. Here is what he said in his book entitled "Division and Reunion" (p. 227):

The other leading questions of those years were the granting of pensions and the regulation of immigration. Congress had hastened from one lavish vote to another in providing pensions for the soldiers who had fought in the Civil War, until at length generosity had passed into folly. President Cleveland, for the time, put a stop to the reckless process by a vigorous use of his veto power.

This is a little flash-light photograph of what was going on in the mind of Prof. Thomas Woodrow Wilson long after he had reached the age of maturity. I am tolerably familiar with his history during the ensuing years of his eventful progress from the college halls to the White House, and I know nothing that has occurred during that period that would reform the sentiments of his heart or revise the logic of his brain upon this question. [Applause.] He thought then that the pittance which was allowed these old heroes by the altogether too tardy action of Congress was "hastening from one lavish vote to another"; that the act of June 27, 1890, which he evidently had in mind and which allowed them 30 or 40 cents a day to support themselves and their families, was "generosity" to a degree that justified him in calling it "folly," and that Congress was engaged in a "reckless process" when it did this; and he was manifestly gratified over the fact that President Cleveland made such a "vigorous use of his veto power" in preventing them from getting a few more cents a day to help keep the wolf from the door. How proud I am that I never cast my vote for a man who could harbor in his heart such sentiments toward these helpless old men who did so much for our country.

I beg to remind you that not only the Sherwood bill would have failed to pass if it had not received the support of the Republicans, but that it was passed by a Republican Senate and signed by a Republican President. And yet you Democrats claim and made hundreds of thousands of people believe that President Taft was opposed to and would veto such a bill. I wonder if there is a soldier in the country, or anyone else for that matter, who believes that if the Sherwood bill had not been passed until Woodrow Wilson became President he would have signed such a bill, even if he had permitted Congress to pass it, which I very much doubt. [Laughter.]

No, Mr. Chairman; you can not change the facts of history any more than a leopard can change its spots, and those facts show beyond the possibility of contradiction that up to this good day your party as a party is not entitled to the credit which its leaders have claimed as the friend and champion of the soldiers of the country. They show, on the contrary, that the Republican Party, both in Congress and in the administration of the Pension Bureau, has steadfastly adhered to its unbroken policy of justice, equity, and liberality to the defenders of the Nation and their dependents, while the Democratic Party, as a party, has just as consistently adhered to its time-honored policy of opposition to pensions. As I have already conceded, there are some notable individual exceptions to this. These exceptions embrace several classes of Democrats. First, there are those Democrats who represent northern constituencies, where the soldier element and their relatives and friends are numerous. These men believe in pensions and honestly support a liberal pension system. They represent the wishes of their constituents, as it is their duty to do. Again, there are some old men from the South, whose views time has changed and whose hearts age has softened. These men have a genuine and hearty desire, unmixed with prejudice, to be just and liberal toward the old soldiers. Whatever of animosity these men may

have formerly felt has been buried. Then there are some young men from the South, who were either too young during the Civil War to remember its hardships and animosities or who were born since the war and are free, more or less, from its prejudices and passions.

These view the subject from a more practical standpoint and are actuated by mixed motives of generosity and political as well as governmental expediency. There is still another class who, while personally believing in the old-time Democratic policy of antagonism to pensions, are nevertheless willing for the sake of their Democratic brethren in soldier districts to yield their own judgment and forego their natural inclination to vote against pension measures for the supposed political advantage that will accrue to the Democratic Party as a whole. Such was not their attitude, however, when the great preponderance of Democratic voting strength came from the solid South. In making up this classification I have run across still another subdivision among the membership of this body. This consists of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who on this subject is sui generis. [Laughter.] Judging from his various utterances, to which I have always listened attentively, he belongs in a class by himself. He has said many things in these pension debates with which I wholly disagree and some things that I thought were extremely unkind and unjust to the soldiers and pensioners of the country; but I am in hearty accord with what he has said about giving equal and exact justice to all of them, and if my time will permit me, I desire before closing to point out some instances in which this has not been done. There is another thing that I wish in all candor and fairness to say here. I want to give credit to the present Democratic régime in this body for not packing the Committee on Invalid Pensions, of which I have the pleasure and honor to be a member, so as to have a majority of it antagonistic to dealing justly and liberally with this question. Two or three of the Democratic membership of that committee have hardly ever attended any of its meetings and have taken practically no part in its work. As to these I can not speak with personal knowledge, but as to those who have actively participated with us in the work of the committee I cheerfully bear testimony that, almost without exception, they are men of broad and liberal minds and generous hearts, and in dealing with the various cases that have come before us they have exercised to the fullest the equitable jurisdiction with which the committee was vested when this House created it. I shall cherish throughout my life the memory of my cordial and most congenial association with them. [Applause.]

And, Mr. Chairman, I desire to be entirely just and fair toward all other Democratic Members of this body, and I should deeply regret it were I to inaccurately state any fact or draw any unwarranted conclusion as to their attitude on this great question. As in all other things, there are underlying conditions which account for the movements of congressional sentiment on this pension subject which are naturally and logically responsible for the results produced. I have already mentioned some of these—time's effect on the animosities and prejudices of the Civil War; the change in personnel, bringing a younger and newer element on the scene, and the obligation which some individuals feel to yield their personal inclination to party fealty. There are still other important and potential reasons for the changed attitude of individual Democrats. The population is shifting constantly and likewise the distribution of pension money, whereas formerly the beneficiaries of our pension law were nearly all located in the States that remained in the Union. Now they are scattered all over the land, the States of the South almost without exception containing thousands of pensioners, survivors and dependents of the soldiers of three wars. It may be surprising to some of you to know that there is nearly \$400,000 more pension money paid to citizens of Texas than is paid to those of Vermont, more in Georgia than in Delaware, more in each of the States of Louisiana and Florida than in the State of Rhode Island, twice as much in the State of Virginia as in Rhode Island, and a million and a half more in Tennessee than in Connecticut. These figures show, I think, one reason for the greater liberality manifested toward the pension system by some of our younger Democratic friends from the South. They show, among other things, the political wisdom and economic foresight of some of our Democratic brethren either in voting for liberal pensions or else withholding their opposition thereto.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there were more pensions paid in the State of Georgia than in the State of Connecticut?

Mr. LANGLEY. No; I said that there was more pension money paid in Georgia than in the State of Delaware, and more in Tennessee by a million and a half dollars than in the State of Connecticut.

Mr. BARTLETT. And more in Texas than in what State?

Mr. LANGLEY. More in Texas than in the State of Vermont.

Mr. EAGLE. You could put the whole population of Vermont into one county in Texas.

Mr. LANGLEY. That may be, but it does not affect the point that I am making, however.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman knows that in comparing Georgia with Delaware, it was very difficult to get soldiers into the Army from Delaware, and very few went into the Army from that State. It is a very small State.

Mr. LANGLEY. Oh, I take it for granted that everybody knows the geography of the country and the relative size of the various States and their population. I am not seeking to conceal anything about that.

Mr. BARTLETT. You could put Delaware in the county in which I live.

Mr. LANGLEY. That may be true also. I am not advised as to that. I am simply trying to show an excuse for some of you changing your minds lately. More of the money is going south.

But shift as Democratic sentiment may, like the sands of the sea; shift as population and pension disbursements may, to account for much of the eleventh-hour change of heart of individual Democrats on this question; shift as sectional Democratic strength may, creating political exigencies to harass those who act for the sake of expediency alone, the large, overshadowing, convincing fact of the history of pension legislation remains unchanged and unchangeable, that the Republican Party, in season and out, in good and evil report, in power and out of power, has been the constant advocate of and has held tenaciously to the doctrine, policy, and practice of liberal pensions to those who fought under the Stars and Stripes in every conflict into which our flag has been carried. [Applause.]

On the other hand, taking the Democratic organization as a whole, the fact that the dominant power and influence of Democracy is and has always been, particularly since the Civil War, wielded against pension legislation stands uncontradicted and incontrovertible. The Sherwood bill, even, was wrung by political exigency from the unwilling hands of those of you who were really against it and could have prevented its passage. Upon the faces of many of you I could see written that sullen determination born of the resolve toward your Democratic brethren of the North which, put into polite English, meant: "This time, but no more—thus far shalt thou go, and no farther."

MONTHLY PAYMENT BILL.

If I had the time I should like to cite some things that have occurred during this Congress which confirm my contention that the Democratic Party is not as friendly to the soldier as it professes to be. I will mention an instance or two in passing. Pensioners all over the country are put at a disadvantage because they have to wait three months before getting their pension checks. They have to discount their quarterly payments, often at excessive rates, or keep running accounts with merchants, and it goes without saying that they do not always get articles on a cash basis. Moreover, there are a great many people who do not understand that accrued pension due at date of death is available to pay the expenses of the last sickness and burial, and many times an old soldier does not get the benefits of his pension during the last days of his life, when he most needs it. They have asked for a monthly payment law, but your Democratic leaders are holding it back because they say it will cost too much. Again the law gives preference to honorably discharged soldiers and sailors and their widows in the matter of appointment and retention in office, and yet it is a matter of common knowledge that this law is being flagrantly violated under the present administration. I shall, however, take occasion at another time to discuss this and to give specific instances.

There is a lesson to be learned from all this by the soldiers of the country, their relatives, and friends. I might say rather that it is an object lesson of what they may expect from the Democratic Party in the years to come if it should remain in power. That party controls both branches of Congress, and perhaps the Presidency also, because of an almost solid Democratic South added to the inroads it has made in the Northern States. Indeed, the Democratic membership of this House is now almost equally balanced between the North and the South. No conservative, well-informed student of the political history of our country will deny that sooner or later the political pendulum

will swing the other way—in fact, it has already begun to swing—and that this will result in the reduction in the Democratic membership almost entirely from the Northern States. As this process of reduction goes on the relative power of the South, already in the saddle in the councils of Democracy, will necessarily be increased. The South being the seat of antipathy to pensions will, of course, control the policy of the party on that question, and in view of the rapid, and I might add alarming, growth of the power of King Caucus the continued control of Congress by Democracy bodes no good for the future of our pension system. My advice to the soldiers of the country and to all those who are interested in or are advocates of the continuance of our liberal pension policy is to exercise the power which they have and see to it that while the Democracy of the South is thus returning to supreme control in the councils of that party it be likewise put in the minority in this and the other branch of Congress where it can not do any harm. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If time permitted, I would like to reply to some of the unjust things that have been said in this House during this session about the soldiers and pensioners of the country. Shame upon you gentlemen, and especially you of Texas whose people have been the greatest sufferers from the brutality and inhumanity of Mexicans, for what you have said about pension grabbers and about the pension roll being a roll of dishonor and of graft. Scarcely had the echo of your bitter invective died away before the blood of our brave young men was crimsoning the soil of Mexico. Well may you cease this unjust criticism in the face of this new evidence of the patriotism and valor of our soldiers and sailors. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, every dollar that a government spends for pensions makes that government just that much stronger among its citizenship. The money goes into every channel of trade, and in numerous instances prevents a ward of the nation from being placed upon the charity of the community or State in which he lives. I can think of nothing more deplorable than for a man who has defended his country's flag in his young manhood and vigor to enter a poorhouse after he has, by reason of age or disability, become unable to earn a livelihood. I hope to live to see the day when every man who has been a soldier, sailor, or marine, who has offered or stood ready to offer his life—the supremest of human sacrifices—for his country's honor, will be allowed a pension when he is unable to labor for his support, whether that condition resulted from his service or otherwise. Many young men went to Cuba and the Philippines and came back broken in health and have been invalids ever since, but on account of the technical requirements as to proof, the absence of hospital records, and his inability to find his scattered comrades who were with him in those distant lands he has been denied a pension on the ground of his inability to prove that his disability was of service origin.

PRACTICE TOO RIGID.

Some gentlemen seem to think that it is a very easy matter to get a pension allowed in the Pension Office. I worked as a clerk in that office for several years and I know better. Thousands of claims are rejected when there is no record in the War Department of the disability alleged and no medical evidence showing its existence at date of discharge or for some time thereafter. Many a faithful soldier has been denied a pension that he deserved because he stayed out of the hospital and therefore has no hospital record to sustain his claim. For several years it has been the practice in the Pension Office to reject claims on the ground I have just stated.

Frequently a soldier's statement at discharge that he was not disabled is quoted in contradiction of his subsequent allegation that he was, and his failure to claim pension promptly after he left the service is also made the basis of a presumption adverse to his claim refuting evidence that would otherwise be sufficient to establish it. I look upon the Pension Office as a great court. It ought to be a court of justice and liberality. It decides more cases than any other court in our land. It is supposed to decide a case upon the evidence alone, but I can show you wherein it often fails to do that. For example, take a claim for rheumatism. The claimant waited 40 years before filing. He alleges that during the Garfield campaign in 1862, on the Big Sandy River, near Pikeville, Ky., he underwent great exposure, resulting in rheumatism; that it affected his legs and arms and shoulders; that at times he could not walk on account of it; that he was not treated in a hospital for it, but that he got liniment and applied it himself; that this disease troubled him at times during the remainder of his service and continued after he got home; that it prevented him from following his occupation regularly; that he got treatment from two or three

physicians from time to time, but that they are all dead; that for the remainder of the time he used home remedies; that he delayed applying for a pension because he did not need it then.

The Pension Office gives him an order to go before a board of surgeons for examination and at the same time calls on him for proof to establish the claim. The board examines him and finds rheumatism. He finally locates two or three of his comrades, who swear that they remember that he had rheumatism in the service about the time he alleges; that his limbs and joints were swollen; that they saw him using liniment; that he was excused at times on account of this trouble, which still existed at the time of his discharge. He furnishes the affidavits of neighbors who have lived near him and have known him ever since the war, and they swear that he has been troubled with rheumatism every year since the war. In due time he will receive a letter which reads something like this:

Your claim based on rheumatism is rejected on the ground of no record in the War Department; no medical or other satisfactory evidence showing origin in service, existence at discharge, or continuance since, and your evident inability to furnish such evidence.

Feeling the injustice of this action, he gets still other testimony to corroborate that already filed, but he is curtly advised in reply that this additional evidence has been considered and does not warrant a reopening of the claim. If the witnesses in support of such a claim are shown to be persons of credibility I contend that it is unjust to reject such a claim. There are many disabilities, like rheumatism, as to the existence of which a layman is a competent witness as well as a physician. I do not underestimate the importance of getting the best testimony possible in such cases, nor do I overlook the rule of evidence requiring it, but I am convinced that thousands of just claims have been rejected and stand rejected to-day because of the enforcement of this altogether too rigid rule.

Many years ago Congress passed a law providing for the employment of special examiners whose duty it was supposed to be to aid the claimants in locating witnesses, they being oftentimes unable to provide the expense of doing so themselves, and thereby help them to establish the claim when it was just. I have no hesitancy in saying that in my judgment a majority of those special examiners failed to try to do what Congress intended. They would catechize a witness in such a way as to frighten him and make him forget what he really did know. I know of cases in which they would tell a witness that he was not a physician, and was therefore not capable of diagnosing a disease, and would finally get from him and put in the report of his testimony virtually an admission that he knew nothing about the case. In this way many meritorious cases have been defeated when if due weight had been given to the testimony of a man's neighbors and associates, who could recognize rheumatism, sore eyes, and various other disabilities that I could name, just as well as a physician could, they would have been allowed. Of course, many special examiners did not do this, but tried their best to get at the actual merits of the claims. I am not charging that these things have happened under any particular administration. I mention them in support of my contention that the Government in administering the pension laws has not been as liberal or as just in pension cases as a court of justice in the circumstances ought to have been.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Congress in waiting 25 years, as it did, before granting pensions to disabled soldiers and sailors without requiring proof of service origin of disability waited entirely too long. Judging from what some of our Democratic friends have said on the subject, it is evident that they think we should wait at least that long before pensioning our soldiers, sailors, and marines who have fought our battles since the Civil War. It has now been 16 years since our War with Spain. I know of many who participated in that war who are now unable to earn a support and who can not prove that their disability was contracted in the service. I think we have waited long enough in their cases, and I for one am ready to vote for a bill to pension these men who served their country and are now unable to work and are in need of assistance without requiring them to prove the origin of their disability. I am aware that the edict has gone forth from Democratic leaders in this body that no more general pension legislation is to be considered at this session, and therefore it is useless to take the matter up now; but I give notice that we will do so next winter. Gentlemen say that it will cost too much. I do not know how much it might cost; I have not figured on that. The first question is, do they need it and do they deserve it? I say they do, and I am willing to give it to them, regardless of its cost, and thus show to the nations of the world that our Treasury stands back of our needy and disabled defenders. To

those who are worrying about the cost of it let me say that at each stage of the expansion of our liberal pension policy the same worrying has been indulged in, and yet the country has met it all and still prospers.

I have said before in this House, and I want to say it again, that if for the time being our revenues should not be sufficient to meet the expense of providing adequately for all those who are so richly entitled to the Nation's gratitude and bounty, I would gladly vote for the issue of bonds to meet it, and when the next generation reads the glorious story of the struggles of these men, and when their hearts swell with pride and patriotism as they think of the rich heritage of which our Republic is possessed in consequence of their service, I know they will thank us for giving them the privilege and the honor of paying their share of tribute to these heroes and their dependents.

In connection with the cost of paying all these pensions, I beg to remind you that more than a hundred of the old soldiers of the Civil War are dying every day. Nearly 40,000 answered the last roll call in 1913. Nearly all of them have now reached three score and ten, the allotted life of man in Holy Writ. The death rate will be much greater this year than last, and it will grow greater year by year so rapidly that within a decade there will be but a tottering remnant left of that magnificent band of young men who returned gallantly and triumphantly to their homes after the news from Appomattox foretold the matchless destiny of a reunited Republic. [Applause.] Already the effect of this rapid death rate is manifest by the amount carried by this bill, which is over \$11,000,000 less than the appropriation of last year. When I think of the old fellows and their widows who have passed away without getting what they needed for their comfort in the closing days of their lives, and of those who are yet tottering on the brink of the grave in need of attention and the necessities of life, it grieves me to see the pension appropriation reduced. I would like to see it kept high enough and long enough to not only keep the wolf from the door of every veteran of the Civil War, his widow, and dependents, but to bring the sunshine of comfort into the home of every one of these old heroes and keep it there so long as we are honored with his presence in this world.

PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. Chairman, I have already referred to the fact that the policy of our Government, originating in colonial days, of granting public lands to the defenders of the country has been abandoned, and that the only advantage given for service in our wars since 1855 has been to credit the service on the period of actual residence required. In other words, a Civil War veteran, however old and feeble he may be, has to establish an actual residence on the land, and maintain it for at least a year, and in many instances much longer, before he can acquire title to it. It is impossible for him to do this now, and this provision of law is therefore a nullity so far as the veterans of the Civil War are concerned. We have hundreds of millions of acres of public unappropriated lands, much of which the Government could easily spare. I am in favor of returning to the earlier policy of the Nation by making some feasible distribution of a part of these lands among the veterans of the Civil War without requiring them to establish a residence thereon.

CHARGE OF DESERTION.

There is a class of soldiers of the Civil War who are unjustly denied a pension. I refer to those who are charged with desertion, because of their failure to return to their commands when, as a matter of fact, they had not the slightest intention to desert. Scores of such cases have come to my personal attention of men who were absent from their commands under proper military authority and were taken sick, or cut off by the enemy, or prevented by some other insurmountable obstacle from returning to duty. I know of many cases in the mountains of Kentucky where conditions were such as to render return to duty impossible and where a report to the commanding officer was equally impossible, and yet these men stand charged with desertion and can not get a pension. You may answer that there is a general law under which this charge can be removed by the War Department; but what is that law?

It provides, for instance, that where a soldier was prevented from returning to duty by disability he must not only prove the fact that such disability prevented him from returning, but that the disability was incurred in the service and line of duty. He might prove conclusively that it was beyond human possibility for him to return, and yet that will not avail him anything. He might prove that after he got home on furlough he contracted typhoid fever and was bedfast and helpless until his command was mustered out of service, and yet the War

Department, under the law, would not remove the charge, because he could not prove that he contracted typhoid fever in the service, and he could not prove it because it was not true. I could cite cases where soldiers were unable to return to duty because they were prisoners of war at the time, and I know of one instance where it was shown that the reason the soldier could not return to his command was because he was dead, and yet the charge of desertion still stood. Such a law is ridiculous and absurd, and yet it seems impossible to get it amended or to get relief for these men in any other way, and whenever we make the effort the cry that we are proposing to pension deserters is raised. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to pensioning deserters myself, just as much as anyone else is, but I do not concede that Congress can not draft a law which would do justice without rewarding anyone unjustly. I, for one, would rather see a score of those not entitled receive a pension than to have one who is entitled denied that right.

WIDOWS MARRIED SUBSEQUENT TO JUNE 27, 1890.

Another instance of injustice in our present pension system is the provision which denies pension to those widows who married the soldier or sailor subsequent to June 27, 1890. I remember very well the discussion which led up to the enactment of that provision. It was well known that in many instances young women married soldiers who were well advanced in years and whose physical condition made it evident that they would not live for a great while, so that these young women acquired a pensionable status without having made the sacrifices which constituted the primary purpose of Congress in providing widows' pensions. It was to stop this practice of taking advantage of these old men that the provision referred to was enacted. The very fact that this law existed when marriages since that date took place eliminates the real reason for its enactment. It has now been in force for nearly a quarter of a century and there are thousands of cases of widows like this where they have lived with the soldier for many years, and in some cases, of course, nearly a quarter of a century, and have nursed and cared for him to the end. To deny pension in such cases is a great injustice. Indeed, Congress has repeatedly acknowledged that injustice by granting pension in many such cases by special act. But to grant pensions in some cases and deny them in others equally deserving only adds the injustice of discrimination to the injustice which the law itself does. We ought to repeal that limitation and make provision for the deserving cases of widows which it denies a pension. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I have never felt that \$12 a month is enough pension to give to those widows of the Civil War who married the soldier before or during the service and who had all of the anxieties and burdens that fell upon them while the husband was absent in the service of his country.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would please excuse me at this time. At the conclusion of my remarks I would be very glad to yield to him.

The history of the Civil War is filled with soul-stirring instances of their trials and their heroism. We ought to give them a substantial increase. Indeed, I would support a proposition which would increase the pension of all Civil War widows, especially when they are disabled and needy and who therefore come within the class of those to whom we do grant relief by special act. That would be simply a matter of justice.

STATE MILITIA ORGANIZATIONS.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to discuss the question of granting a pension to members of State militia organizations who aided in the suppression of the Rebellion, although never actually mustered into the service of the United States, and it is still my purpose to do so, but on a later date. I have addressed the House on this subject several times since I have been a Member of it, but I have always done so in connection with other pension matters. This time I propose to discuss that question alone, and in the near future I shall ask you to hear me upon it and I think I can convince you with the evidence that I have accumulated that the delay of Congress in recognizing the great service that these old men rendered the country is not only unpardonable, but an act of ingratitude that ought to put it to shame. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia desired to ask me a question, I believe? I shall take pleasure in yielding, if I have any time left.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has just half a minute remaining.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I can not ask the question in that time.

Mr. LANGLEY. Very well.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the following joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution designating the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day, and for other purposes.

PENSIONS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, how much time has the gentleman from Georgia used?

The CHAIRMAN. One hour and thirty-six minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. J. M. C. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the opportunity to address the House at this late hour in the day, and while my remarks do not deal precisely with the bill we are now considering, they are upon a subject that is now engaging the attention of the American people and the American Congress, a subject that is not equalled by any other except the Mexican situation, and I refer to the contest now being waged for the repeal of the Panama tolls, with a slight reference to the bill we have just considered, the question of battleships.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of two battleships, and would vote for more. I do this in order to uphold our national dignity and to keep pace in a halting way with the leading nations of the earth which talk "peace" and build battleships. England at the present time is constructing 15 dreadnaughts and battle cruisers carrying large guns of the dreadnaught type and fit for first-line duty; Russia, 11; Germany, 9; France, 9; Japan, 7; and Italy, 7; while we are building and have under construction only 5 in the United States. As a sample of what negligence or inattention along this line means we have only to refer to China, with a population of 450,000,000 people and building no dreadnaughts. It is having its country divided and parceled out to the other stronger nations of the world.

I have another reason why I am in favor of more battleships. We are constructing the world's most famous engineering feat ever undertaken by the ingenuity of man. I want to see our battleships go through this canal tolls free, and then, according to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, as voted by this House, under the claim of "entire equality" to all nations, have other nations try to get their battleships through this canal tolls free.

Mr. Chairman, I herewith incorporate the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty affecting the use of the canal, the law exempting tolls, and the bill to repeal that law, as a part of my remarks:

ARTICLE 3.

The United States adopts, as the basis of the neutralization of such ship canal, the following rules, substantially as embodied in the convention of Constantinople, signed the 28th October, 1888, for the free navigation of the Suez Canal, that is to say:

1. The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

2. The canal shall never be blockaded nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

3. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not revictual nor take any stores in the canal except so far as may be strictly necessary; and the transit of such vessels through the canal shall be effected with the least possible delay in accordance with the regulations in force and with only such intimation as may result from the necessities of the service. Prizes shall be in all respects subject to the same rules as vessels of war of the belligerents.

4. No belligerent shall embark or disembark troops, munitions of war, or warlike materials in the canal, except in case of accidental hindrance of the transit, and in such case the transit shall be resumed with all possible dispatch.

5. The provisions of this article shall apply to waters adjacent to the canal within 3 marine miles of either end. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not remain in such waters longer than 24 hours at any one time, except in case of distress, and in such case shall depart as soon as possible; but a vessel of war of one belligerent shall not depart within 24 hours from the departure of a vessel of war of the other belligerent.

6. The plant, establishments, buildings, and all works necessary to the construction, maintenance, and operation of the canal shall be deemed to be part thereof for the purposes of this treaty, and in time of war, as in time of peace, shall enjoy complete immunity from attack or injury by belligerents and from acts calculated to impair their usefulness as part of the canal. (Entered into Nov. 18, 1901.)

Law passed by Congress:

SEC. 5. That the President is hereby authorized to prescribe and from time to time change the tolls that shall be levied by the Government of the United States for the use of the Panama Canal: *Provided*, That no tolls, when prescribed as above, shall be changed unless six months' notice thereof shall have been given by the President by proclamation. No tolls shall be levied upon vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States. That section 4132 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows: (Approved Aug. 24, 1912.)

Section 1 of the act to repeal the exemption clause of the above statute passed the House March 31, 1914, and now being considered in the Senate provides:

An act to amend section 5 of "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal and the sanitation of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912.

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence in section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal, and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912, which reads as follows: "No tolls shall be levied upon vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

I want to see if under the "entire equality provision" claimed by the majority, if we charge tolls to foreign battleships for passing through the canal whether we must also charge our own battleships tolls.

I want to see whether or not we can take tolls from our own battleships and merchantmen on entering the canal and pay that toll back to them at the other end when they come out, and then apply this rule of "entire equality" to all the nations of the earth, and see whether or not those nations will exact that this same ridiculous performance of charging vessels tolls on going in and giving it back to them on coming out will meet this "entire equality" to all nations in the use of our canal.

I want to see whether or not we can hold the warships of other nations for 24 hours before they will be permitted to pass through the canal, and we ad libitum under this "entire equality" of use to all nations of the canal pass our warships through.

I want to see whether or not under the "equalization" claim of the majority of this House if we can victual, unload, or embark soldiers on our boats in our canal and deny this right to other nations.

I want to see whether or not under the construction claimed by the friends of "equalization" we can land our troops in the Canal Zone from our own warships and unload our merchandise and war supplies in the zone and other merchandise belonging to the United States and deny this right to the other nations of the earth, conforming to the rules of the treaty. Mr. Chairman, it can not be done. In other words, who does the canal belong to anyway?

The President of the United States himself, before election, was unequivocally in favor of free tolls to our American coastwise shipping, and so stated.

Speaking of this provision in the Democratic platform, President Wilson, at Washington Park, N. J., on August 5, 1912, said:

"One of the great objects in cutting that great ditch across the Isthmus of Panama is to allow farmers who are near the Atlantic to ship to the Pacific by way of the Atlantic ports.

"Now, at present there are no ships to do that, and one of the bills pending—passed, I believe, yesterday by the Senate as it had passed the House—provides for free tolls for American ships through that canal, and prohibits any ship from passing through which is owned by any American railroad company.

"You see the object of that, don't you? We don't want the railroads to compete with themselves, because we understand that kind of competition. We want water carriage to compete with land carriage, so as to be perfectly sure that you are going to get better rates around the canal than you would across the continent.

"Our platform is not molasses to catch flies. It means business. It means what it says. It is the utterance of earnest and honest men, who intend to do business along those lines and who are not waiting to see whether they can catch votes with those promises before they determine whether they are going to act upon them or not."

It is no credit to the great President of the United States nor the high office he holds to change front, turn his coat, and want us to deliver up our sovereignty over the canal. To me it looks like a stain on our national honor and a blow at the dignity of the great American people.

I want to see what becomes of the plank in the Democratic platform upon which a great national election was won, which provides:

We favor the exemption from toll of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the canal.

And this was the position of the other great parties supported strongly by the will and wish of a majority of the American people.

I would like to know whether or not the American people would have ever stood for the expense of building the Panama Canal at a cost of \$400,000,000 if they knew it was to be supervised, dictated, controlled, or interfered with by any other nation on earth. The rate of tolls now charged will not pay one-half the upkeep; that is doing enough for other nations.

I want to know whether or not my colleague, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, would convey to Great Britain the Territory of Alaska in order to appease England or any other nation on earth to waive its interest in the Panama Canal?

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 258) providing for the repeal of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty as one of the conditions of the proposed transfer of southeastern Alaska to Canada.

Whereas the Hay-Pauncefote treaty has proved to be, and will continue to be, a source of dispute, and therefore of irritation, to the people of the United States; and

Whereas the narrow coast strip of southeastern Alaska, keeping one-third of western Canada from free access to the Pacific, is a source of irritation to the people of Canada; and

Whereas in the interest of the peace movement, especially for the sake of example, it is desirable that all sources of international irritation be removed whenever possible: Therefore be it

Resolved, *etc.*, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to negotiate with the British and Canadian Governments regarding the transfer of southeastern Alaska to Canada by sale or exchange, or both, the repeal of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty being made one of the conditions of transfer.

Why does he not offer to convey or "cede" the great State of Maryland instead of Alaska? Maryland was named after a British Queen, and its principal metropolis, Baltimore, is named after one of the greatest of British lords, who obtained a proprietary right to this great State from Charles I. I do not think my colleague from Maryland voices the sentiment of all the "Smiths," not even of the "John Smiths." We bought Alaska from Russia for a mere pittance of \$7,200,000, and we have already received from this rich Territory the stupendous sum of \$464,000,000 in its products, without so much as even beginning to deplete its resources; in fact, the riches of Alaska are bewildering; and since it was ceded to us for such a pittance, it would be more in harmony with exact justice and "entire equality" to all nations on earth for us to give it back to Russia instead of to England.

I now see a merchantman loaded at New York or Galveston plying the Mississippi River duty free and unloading at St. Louis without tolls.

I want to see that same vessel and cargo loaded at the same ports and pass through the Panama Canal to San Francisco under "entire equality" to ourselves and to our own people, canal tolls free; that would look like "entire equality" to ourselves.

If a merchantman must pay tolls to ply the canal, then the rate paid must be added to the cost of the article and, in familiar Democratic vernacular, be paid by the consumer. The coastwise man can not pay the tolls of his ship and cargo out of his own pocket, but if he pays for transport through the canal he must get his money back, and this amount will be charged to the transport of the commodity and ultimately paid by the consumer.

I want to find out what nation, if any, is complaining about free tolls to our American coastwise shipping through our canal. I have listened attentively to the speeches and arguments made, and have concluded that there is not a nation on earth, England not excepted, that has made a formal protest against free use of the canal to our coastwise trade.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. I will also call to the gentleman's attention the fact that the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in a speech the other day stated positively that there were no foreign complications, as far as he knew.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I am very much obliged for the remark. I have read during the interim that a fund of \$30,000 has been expended by Mr. Carnegie, and that 750,000 speeches of one of the most distinguished Senators in the Congress of the United States have been sent under Government frank, mailed free, broadcast throughout our land to work up a sentiment against free tolls to our coastwise American shipping. I would listen to the condemnation of the great American people if such a propaganda were carried on by the friends of free tolls; "it would resound to heaven."

I want to see how our Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan, can give free tonnage and free everything else to the State of Panama and to the State of Colombia, under this "entire equality" use of the canal to all nations of the earth, and deny this privilege to the United States.

I would like to know what nation on earth has subscribed to the rules allowing or permitting it to use the canal under the terms of the treaty on "entire equality," and what share of the expense and upkeep they agree to pay. It will not be Panama nor Colombia.

[From the Washington Post, Wednesday, May 6, 1914.]

COLOMBIA SPEEDS TREATY—FACT BY WHICH UNITED STATES IS TO PAY \$25,000,000 PASSES FIRST READING.

BOGOTA, COLOMBIA, May 5.

The treaty between Colombia and the United States, settling the long-standing dispute over Panama, passed its first reading in the Colombian Senate to-day.

The treaty provides that Colombia shall enjoy freely and in perpetuity free passage through the Panama Canal for her troops and warships, and stipulates also that six months after the exchange of ratifications the sum of \$25,000,000 shall be paid to Colombia.

Who is to determine and enforce these rules and requirements? Why should the American Nation construct the canal? Why should it police it, care for it, defend it in perpetuity, without sovereignty, privileges, or control?

Why did we permit 47,000,000 tons to pass through St. Marys Canal tolls free last year, and now complain because our American shippers would forsooth carry 1,000,000 tons duty free through the Panama Canal, which they likewise helped to construct?

Where is the exact and equal terms and that high and lofty justice, love of humanity, and regard toward all nations sitting, when England charges American vessels for entering her canal a much higher rate than we charge English merchantmen for entering ours? There were shipped through the Suez Canal 16,581,898 tons of merchandise in 1910. What great advantage, abuse, or hatred toward England is found in the fact that we pay \$1.30 a ton for shipping merchandise through the Suez Canal and have fixed a rate of \$1.20 a ton for merchandise to be shipped through our Panama Canal, although in that I might, if I adopt the "equalization" scheme, be more exact to call it "the American and English Panama Canal"? The question of ship subsidy has taken on great proportions in the consideration of the rates for this canal, but was voted without dissent in the Underwood tariff bill in allowing 5 per cent rebate to imports carried on American ships. Why is this not attacked for violation of ship subsidy?

That a discount of 5 per cent on all duties imposed by this act shall be allowed on such goods, wares, and merchandise as shall be imported in vessels admitted to registration under the laws of the United States.

Ship subsidy in 1914 was ship subsidy in 1912 when this tolls act was passed by a majority of this House voting for this bill, which it is sought to repeal now.

SUBSIDY.

Was it ship subsidy to expend \$260,000,000 in the last six years for our rivers and harbors?

Is it river subsidy to expend \$300,000,000 for the improvement of the Mississippi River?

Is it cotton subsidy to expend \$1,000,000 for the eradication of the boll weevil?

Is it cattle subsidy to expend Government revenue for the eradication of the cattle tick?

Is expending \$25,000,000 for highways an automobile subsidy?

Is everything a person opposes to be dominated "subsidy and graft"?

Is paying a duty to other nations on our exports while we admit their exports into our country free of duty a foreign subsidy?

When a State receives more revenue from the Government than the Government receives from the State, is that a State subsidy?

Is paying higher wages to American labor than is paid by foreign countries to their laborers a labor subsidy?

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the way in which we secured the Panama Canal Zone. To those careful critics I refer them to a perusal of the way in which England secured control and sovereignty over the Suez Canal—to an article found in the Fortnightly Review of September, 1893, entitled "England's right to the Suez shares," by Mr. Whitehouse, which will tell the story. The canal strictly was an asset of the Egyptian Government. It was pawned in 1876 by Ismail Pasha, Khedive of Egypt, for the purpose of procuring a private loan, and taken over by England on a forfeiture of the pledge of \$20,000,000. Mr. Whitehouse says the shares belonged to Egypt, but were pledged by Ismail, and further, that "the transaction of 1876 belongs to a class against which a court of equity has never failed to give relief." The use of public property to pay a private debt is not unquestionable, it can not be done. Mr.

W. S. Blunt, in his work entitled "Secret history of the English occupation of Egypt," in an eloquent plea for the rights of the Egyptians, denounces the robberies which the English Government has perpetrated on the Egyptians, and said:

If you do not think the Egyptian needs the money, which we as a nation have taken from him, go look at his ribs.

I would like to know what is secreted and covered up in the President's message to the great Congress of the United States when he told us to repeal the tolls law to our American coastwise shipping whether it is right or wrong, and I now insert that message:

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS—MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES DELIVERED AT A JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS MARCH 5, 1914.

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS: I have come to you upon an errand which can be very briefly performed, but I beg that you will not measure its importance by the number of sentences in which I state it. No communication I have addressed to the Congress carried with it graver or more far-reaching implications as to the interest of the country, and I come now to speak upon a matter with regard to which I am charged in a peculiar degree, by the Constitution itself, with personal responsibility.

I have come to ask you for the repeal of that provision of the Panama Canal act of August 24, 1912, which exempts vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States from payment of tolls, and to urge upon you the justice, the wisdom, and the large policy of such a repeal with the utmost earnestness of which I am capable.

In my own judgment, very fully considered and maturely formed, that exemption constitutes a mistaken economic policy from every point of view, and is, moreover, in plain contravention of the treaty with Great Britain concerning the canal concluded on November 18, 1901. But I have not come to urge upon you my personal views. I have come to state to you a fact and a situation. Whatever may be our own differences of opinion concerning this much debated measure, its meaning is not debated outside the United States. Everywhere else the language of the treaty is given but one interpretation, and that interpretation precludes the exemption I am asking you to repeal. We consented to the treaty; its language we accepted, if we did not originate; and we are too big, too powerful, too self-respecting a Nation to interpret with a too strained or refined reading the words of our own promises just because we have power enough to give us leave to read them as we please. The large thing to do is the only thing we can afford to do, a voluntary withdrawal from a position everywhere questioned and misunderstood. We ought to reverse our action without raising the question whether we were right or wrong, and so once more deserve our reputation for generosity and for the redemption of every obligation without quibble or hesitation.

I ask this of you in support of the foreign policy of the administration. I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure.

Who would be so cowardly as to stand in the great halls of this the greatest legislative body in the world and say that he would vote in accord with that sentiment and to repeal a law that he knew to be right? Why does not the President come forward and take into his confidence the people whom he represents? Or else why not divulge his secret purpose to the great leaders of the affairs of our Nation? Why does he remain silent when one of the greatest legislative battles known to our history is being waged to maintain not only a law which Congress passed by a majority vote but a principle affecting the sovereignty of our Nation and our right to control our own affairs? It was Lincoln who said—

I stand with those who are right. I stand with them while they are right and leave them when they are wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs disclaims that the repeal of the exemption clause in any wise affects or pertains to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. How does that square with the long, ardent, and patriotic speeches made in both branches of Congress that it does? This view is not shared in by those who voted or the public. How does that declaration coincide with the message of the President which expressly states:

Everywhere else the language of the treaty is given but one interpretation, and that interpretation precludes the exemption I am asking you to repeal.

It sounds irony and to me like a surrender, and that the honorable Senator from Missouri, as against the President, must be added to the list of the other distinguished and high authorities that we have a right to fix the toll rate of the canal irrespective of any treaty and for the very patent reason given by them. The construction of the treaty claimed by those wanting repeal is unworkable. When the statute fixing rates is repealed, under what law or right will they be fixed, and when?

I wish to put in the RECORD the explanation of the meaning of the Panama Canal treaty which John Hay gave to the Senate in transmitting the Hay-Pauncefote treaty to that body, taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 13, 1914:

The whole theory of the treaty is that the canal is to be an entirely American canal. The enormous cost of constructing it is to be borne by the United States alone. When constructed it is exclusively the prop-

erty of the United States and is to be managed and controlled and defended by it. The United States alone as the sole owner of the canal as a purely American enterprise adopts and prescribes the rules by which the use of the canal shall be regulated and assumes the entire responsibility and burden of enforcing, without the assistance of Great Britain or of any other nation, its absolute neutrality.

Look at the galaxy of great men championing the cause of free tolls.

Our distinguished Speaker, Mr. CLARK, who barely escaped sitting now in the White House [applause], and if he had been nominated would have saved much more than his annual salary in this very contest; besides, he would have sustained the dignity of our Republic; and the great leader of the majority, Mr. UNDERWOOD, takes the position that it is no violation of our treaty. The President himself, in his message, even half concedes that when he calls on us to "repeal the tolls law, whether it be right or wrong." It may be right. Our great Republican leader, Mr. MANN, yielding to no one in his forensic ability and legislative research, voted against repeal. And Secretary Bryan has already shattered the contention of the opponents of exemption by formulating a treaty for Panama, giving Panama the use of our canal in perpetuity for transport of all of its vessels and troops tolls free; and the able Mr. MURDOCK.

Article 19 of the treaty made with the Republic of Panama on November 18, 1903, provides:

The Government of the Republic of Panama shall have the right to transport over the canal its vessels, and its troops and munitions of war in such vessels, at all times, without paying charges of any kind.

This treaty was made after the ratification of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and discriminates in favor of Panama.

Add to the above eminent citizens the following distinguished and high authority as being in favor of free tolls—ex-Presidents Taft and Roosevelt, who do not think that we have violated the terms of the treaty by exempting our coastwise vessels.

I want to join in the imprecation by our honorable Speaker, in his great speech here on the floor of this House on this question, and with him, sink or swim, against all comers proclaim the sovereignty of the United States and their right to fix the charges for everything, animate and inanimate, that traverses the Panama Canal, which carries the Stars and Stripes, without the dictation or interference of any other nation on earth, or all the nations on earth.

Why must we divide the ownership of our canal? England has not asked this. No other nation has asked it. If done now, it is as a leap "in the dark." Who knows of any nation asking that we repeal the tolls act, or any portion of it? Let us set the canal to work first, and then see. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND].

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CARR] such time as he may desire to consume.

Mr. CARR. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration appropriates for invalid and other pensions for the fiscal year 1915 the sum of \$169,000,000. To this amount should be added the sum of \$150,000, the amount appropriated for the fees of examining surgeons. The appropriation last year amounted to \$180,000,000, the amount this year being a reduction of \$11,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, according to the report of the Commissioner of Pensions the number of pensioners on the roll December 31, 1913, was 805,887. This is a decrease of 14,313 since July 1, 1913, a period of six months. The number of Civil War survivors on the roll December 31, 1913, was 448,138. There were on the rolls at the end of the fiscal year 1913 462,379, showing a loss in six months 14,241.

Since 1861 there have been allowed by special acts of Congress 42,337 pensions and increases of pensions, of which 22,016 are now on the roll with an annual face value of \$6,699,096. Only a part of this is chargeable to special acts, as most of the beneficiaries had been previously pensioned under general laws at lower rates. The detailed statement of the apportionment of the pension rolls among the several States and Territories will be found in the report of the Committee on Appropriations. This report shows that the average annual value of each pension is \$209.08 and the average value of the Civil War pension is \$240.69.

The acts of Congress now in operation governing the granting of pensions to soldiers of the Civil War and their dependents are the acts of May 11, 1912, known as the Sherwood Act, and the special acts to which I have referred.

The Commissioner of Pensions states that the maximum number of new applications under the act of May 11, 1912, was attained last year, and beginning with this year the number will decrease. While the loss by reason of death has been very large, there has been no corresponding decrease in the amount of the appropriation for pensions, due to the fact of the increasing value of each pension from year to year. Nearly all the Civil War soldiers are now under the act of May 11, 1912. The report shows that under this act there are 401,792 Civil War soldiers, 13,063 Navy pensioners, and 1,110 Mexican War soldiers on the rolls.

Mr. Chairman, I append the following table showing the total expenditure for pensions to soldiers, sailors, and marines, their widows and minor children and dependent relatives on account of military and naval service since the founding of this Government. I think that this total will be found very interesting.

War of the Revolution (estimated)-----	\$70,000,000.00
War of 1812 (service pension)-----	45,923,014.46
Indian wars (service pension)-----	12,241,273.61
War with Mexico (service pension)-----	47,632,572.34
Civil War-----	4,294,596,944.47
War with Spain and Philippine insurrection-----	42,185,230.84
Regular Establishment-----	28,461,369.52
Unclassified-----	16,499,419.44
Total-----	4,557,539,824.68

In addition, Mr. Chairman, to the pensions paid in this country we have 5,495 pensioners who reside abroad, the most of whom are not citizens of this country. The total amount paid to these nonresidents is \$1,166,735.

Mr. Chairman, there are now no pensioners on account of the Revolutionary War on the roll. The last widow pensioner of the war was Esther S. Damon, of Plymouth Union, Vt., who died November 11, 1906, aged 92 years. The last survivor of the Revolution was Daniel F. Bakeman, who died at Freedom, Cattaraugus County, N. Y., April 5, 1869, aged 109 years, 6 months, and 8 days.

The last surviving pensioned soldier of the War of 1812 was Hiram Cronk, of Ava, N. Y., who died May 13, 1905, aged 105 years and 16 days. The names of 199 widows of the War of 1812 remained on the pension roll June 30, 1913.

The committee had under consideration the present method of paying pensions. There was some discussion as to whether it was better to make payment under the certificate and voucher system or the check system. The commissioner stated that the present system of paying by check had worked very satisfactory to the department and to everyone concerned. Under the old voucher or certificate system the pensioner would first get his voucher, which he would have to make out at an expense to himself. That voucher would be sent in to be checked up to ascertain if it were correct. If not correct, it would be sent back for correction and the pensioner would get his check, in any event, from 10 to 15 days after the time when it was actually payable. As the vast majority on the pension rolls are dependent, this delay was a matter of serious consequence to them. Under the check system payments are being made when the pensions are actually due, and the system is so arranged that pensioners living on the Pacific coast receive their checks at practically the same time as those residing in the city of Washington. This new system seems to meet with the approbation of the vast majority of old soldiers, and the department is to be congratulated that this method has been adopted. The only objection that thus far has been urged in this method of payment arises from the fact that under the present law, in the event of a check being lost, the pensioner is required to wait six months before he can be paid. This matter should be remedied, and I suggest to the committee an amendment to the present law permitting the bureau to make this payment as soon as possible after notification that the check has been lost.

Mr. Chairman, there was another matter brought to the attention of the committee at the time the hearings were held concerning the time of payment of these checks. It was suggested that perhaps it would be well to pay these pensions monthly instead of quarterly. The commissioner, who had interviewed quite a number of soldiers at various reunions, was of the opinion that sentiment was so divided upon this subject that the committee did not feel justified in recommending a change in the present law. The committee, as will appear from the hearings, was satisfied that the present method was working with entire satisfaction. It therefore comes with poor grace from the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] to charge the Democratic Party with opposition to any change. Mr. Chairman, let me read from the testimony.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CARR. With pleasure.

Mr. WILLIS. What argument was given by anyone against the method of payment of pensions monthly? I will say to the gentleman frankly I have talked with a great many pensioners, and all of them with whom I have talked are strongly in favor of it. I judge from what the gentleman says that some arguments were produced before the committee in reference to that. What were the arguments?

Mr. CARR. I prefer to answer the gentleman's question by reading from the testimony of the Commissioner of Pensions, who appeared before the committee. Mr. DAVIS, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota and a member of the committee, brought to the attention of the committee this question regarding the payment of pensions monthly, and finally the commissioner was asked by Mr. DAVIS:

Mr. DAVIS. There is some agitation of the question of paying pensions monthly instead of quarterly, and that agitation may appear upon the floor of Congress in time. That would necessarily cause some additional expense and would require some additional clerk hire; but, in your opinion as Commissioner of Pensions and as an old soldier, would the additional expense, if any, be overbalanced, so to speak, by the benefits that would accrue to the pensioners if they could receive their pension checks monthly instead of quarterly? I ask your judgment on that as an old soldier and as the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. SALTZGABER. The Commissioner of Pensions is very slow about giving his opinion on proposed legislation, because he believes that it is the duty of the bureau of which he has charge to administer the law, and it is for Congress to determine when pensions shall be granted or paid.

Mr. DAVIS. But Congress usually acts upon information furnished by the bureau.

Mr. SALTZGABER. The monthly payment of pensions was at first favored by me, knowing that some of my old comrades in my immediate neighborhood at home, as I believed, would be benefited by that mode of paying pensions, because whenever they received their pensions for a period of three months, by reason of providence or other causes, they soon spent their funds. When they first received their pensions, they would have a period of feasting, and when it came along toward the end of the three months they would have a period of fasting. My notion was that if this money would come along more frequently the situation might be better. Then, I went down to the Ohio State encampment, and, by request, made an address to the comrades gathered there, and in the course of the address I said we were in favor of the monthly payment of pensions, but instantly they began to call out, "No, no; we don't want it." "Well," I said, "I hope you will appreciate the spirit that prompts the suggestion." They said, "Oh, yes; you are all right; but we do not want pensions paid monthly; we want them paid as they are now." Now, I asked the chairman if I could submit the question to those present, and he said, "Yes; go ahead." So I propounded the question to them, and a majority of them voted against it. At Chattanooga I did not discuss the subject with very many, but I understand that the executive council, which is the highest body next to the grand encampment itself—I am referring now to the national encampment held at Chattanooga—that executive council, after consideration of the subject, which was discussed in the address of the commander in chief, unanimously decided against it.

Mr. DAVIS. Decided against monthly payments?

Mr. SALTZGABER. Yes, sir. So I find a very great division of sentiment, and I am unable to determine whether the majority lies on one side or the other.

Mr. DAVIS. It would seem at first glance as though they would prefer monthly payments, just as the ordinary civilian is paid by the month.

Mr. SALTZGABER. So it struck me. I asked Mr. Campbell, at the request of some Congressmen, to make up an estimate of the additional expense that would be involved, and his estimate is that it would require an additional appropriation of at least \$1,000,000 a year.

Mr. BARTLETT. To cover the additional expense?

Mr. SALTZGABER. Yes, sir; to provide the necessary force and equipment to make the monthly payments.

Now, we thought, in view of such information, that the committee was not in a position to make a recommendation one way or the other and that the present method was satisfactory.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. CARR. Yes; but I had yielded to Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to ask the gentleman, my colleague on the committee, if he does not think that it would be better to distribute that million dollars to the old soldiers than for it to be expended in such expense? I certainly do.

Mr. CARR. I would answer that, Mr. Chairman, that if the soldiers desire to be paid that way, I should certainly think so.

Mr. DAVIS. Certainly.

Mr. CARR. But until there is some expression of sentiment on the part of the soldiers to have the payments made monthly, I do not see that the committee is in any position to take up this matter and make a recommendation to the Congress.

Mr. DAVIS. But if that million dollars were to be spent, and the soldiers not particularly desiring the money to be paid monthly, I say I would rather give that money to the old soldiers in the way of pensions than to have it go to the expenses of paying monthly.

Mr. CARR. I concur heartily in what the gentleman from Minnesota has said, and I would rather add this additional

million dollars to the pension fund than to have it paid out in unnecessary expenses in sending the money out monthly.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CARR. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. I want to say I fully concur with the gentleman's statement; I would rather pay the million dollars out to the pensioners by adding it to the amount of pensions than to have it go as clerk hire. I am greatly interested in the information which the gentleman gave of the action of the soldiers, especially at the Ohio encampment and the national encampment at Chattanooga. I did not get from the gentleman's reading and his very lucid statement any expression of the argument as to why they would be opposed to it. What were the arguments given?

Mr. CARR. I do not recall that before our committee there were any arguments given one way or the other, or any argument advanced by the Commissioner of Pensions when he appeared before the soldiers at these reunions; but I take it from what he had stated that the matter had been thoroughly discussed by them and that the arguments that had been advanced were not sufficient to impel a change in the present policy of Congress.

Mr. DAVIS. The council at Chattanooga was unanimously in favor of leaving it as it was?

Mr. CARR. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I was curious to know what the arguments were, because I have received many letters from ex-soldiers and have had personal solicitation from them in favor of the monthly payment of pensions, and it surprises me to find the facts as the gentleman has stated them.

Mr. CARR. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Ohio is anxious, as the members of the committee are, that the very best method be adopted for paying these pensions.

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CARR. I will be very glad to do so.

Mr. ADAIR. In view of the fact that it costs the Government less than \$100,000 a year to pay the pensioners of the country four times a year, can the gentleman tell us how the commissioner figures it would cost \$1,000,000 extra to pay them twelve times a year?

Mr. CARR. The commissioner stated in his report that he submitted this question to Mr. Campbell. "I asked Mr. Campbell," he said, "at the request of some Congressman, to make up an estimate of the additional expense that would be involved, and his estimate is that the additional expense involved would be \$1,000,000." Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know, of course, how he arrives at that.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. CARR. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Campbell is the disbursing officer of the Pension Office?

Mr. CARR. Yes; he is the disbursing officer.

Mr. BARTLETT. And an employee of long experience and familiar with his duties.

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. CARR. Certainly.

Mr. ADAIR. It occurs to me that a man would not have to be an employee of long experience to know it would not cost a million dollars a year to pay pensioners monthly. Personally, I think it costs too much to pay them monthly. I am not in favor of it, on that account, but I would have to scrutinize the books pretty carefully before anyone could lead me to believe it would cost a million dollars to pay them 12 times a year when it only costs \$100,000 to pay them 4 times a year.

Mr. CARR. Of course, Mr. Campbell is an officer of the Government, and the figures he submits are the best available in ascertaining this cost. Neither am I certain that the statement of the gentleman from Ohio that it costs \$100,000 per year to pay pensions four times a year includes all the cost.

The vast labor necessary to make up a pension roll containing 800,000 names 12 times a year can hardly be realized. Prior to the abolition of pension agencies there were employed 307 permanent clerks, and 162 clerks were employed for 10 days during each quarterly payment period. When the agencies were consolidated with the Pension Bureau the number of clerks were 251. On September 19, 1913, the Comptroller of the Treasury decided that the disbursing clerk for the payment of pensions was the disbursing clerk of the executive department and subject to the provisions of all laws governing disbursing clerks of the executive department. It had been held before that time in the bureau, based upon the decision of the comptroller dated October, 1912, that the disbursing clerk whose fee was provided for in the act of August 17, 1912, was not included within the general provisions of the law with

reference to disbursing clerks of the executive department, but rather that he should be regarded as a pension agent before that time had been regarded. Before the decision of the comptroller the disbursing clerk prepared all vouchers, schedules, and pay rolls and was in possession of all the records of all the former pension agents. After the preparation of the schedules and pay rolls the disbursing clerk certified their correctness to the Commissioner of Pensions. The correctness of the schedules was then certified by the Commissioner of Pensions, and said schedules, with the accounts current, were transmitted to the Auditor for the Interior Department.

Under the present system the pension roll is now in charge of the Finance Division, where are prepared all vouchers or pay rolls or schedules containing the names of the pensioners, the rates of pension, and other essential information, the correctness of which is certified by the Commissioner of Pensions, and the same is placed in the hands of the disbursing clerk as needed for the purpose of pension payments. The disbursing clerk prepares and sends out to all pensioners proper checks, and then makes the necessary notices and certifications of his payments upon the schedules and submits the same and all other papers properly constituting his accounts of pension disbursements to the Finance Division, where the payments are entered upon the roll and the accounts given an administrative examination, after which they are prepared and submitted for the necessary certification and transmission to the Auditor for the Interior Department in accordance with the provision of the acts of July 31, 1894, and August 23, 1912. When the duties of the Disbursing Office was thus changed the number of employees was reduced from 251 to 156.

The Pension Bureau is now one of the busiest of all the departments of the Government. Considering the vast amount of business done, the number of people with whom the bureau is in constant touch, the character and scope of the work, the wonder is that the bureau is able to transact its business with such skill and dispatch as has been evidenced by facts that have come to the knowledge of your committee.

Mr. Chairman, the pension system of the United States commends itself to every American. [Applause.] No Government in this world has treated its soldiers and sailors and their dependents so liberally as this Government has treated its soldiers, sailors, and dependents. We believe that these men who preserved the Nation in time of war are worthy of their country's gratitude. [Applause.] We believe that those who have lost life, limb, or health in the service of the Nation and those dependent should in their own right or that of their legal representatives receive a reward commensurate with the service rendered, so far as the Nation's bounty may be able to measure that service. [Applause.] The pension roll is still "a roll of honor." The nations of the world have recognized the worth of heroic and valiant deeds. They have realized that war is attended with every horror that the human body can experience or the human mind can know. In our own Nation the pension system originated with the Revolutionary War, and the pension policy has been constantly followed since that time. The willing and cheerful spirit with which these appropriations are made by Congress should be a guaranty to every soldier that the Nation which accepted his services in time of its peril has not forgotten him in the days of his adversity. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15280, the pension appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MOTHER'S DAY.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call from the Speaker's table the House joint resolution 263, designating the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day, and for other purposes, and move to agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama calls from the Speaker's table House joint resolution 263, with Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House agree to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

O. J. motion of Mr. HEFLIN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were agreed to was laid on the table.

BESSIE M'ALISTER M'GUIRK.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, I desire to report back the bill (H. R. 4423) for the relief of Bessie McAlister McGuirk, which we think was improperly referred to that committee, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 4423. A bill for the relief of Bessie McAlister McGuirk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOWLER. Will it be proper for me to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the pension bill that is now under discussion? I desire to do so, and ask that the remarks may follow those of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

The SPEAKER. What was the last remark?

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the pension bill that is now under consideration, following the speech of Mr. LANGLEY, of Kentucky.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put the first part of it. Of course, the House could locate the place for the speech by vote. The make-up of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is under the control of the Public Printer, and one of the regulations is to the effect that the speeches which are not delivered in the House shall be printed at the end of the RECORD.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois, that he may extend his remarks in the Record? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Now, the gentleman asks that his speech follow the speech of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], made to-day.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to suggest to my friend from Illinois that it seems to me that that request is hardly a proper one. All the rest of us follow the usual rule. Speeches that are not delivered in the House go in at the back of the RECORD. I hope the gentleman will not make that request. I hope he will withdraw it, and thus save me from the necessity of objecting.

Mr. FOWLER. If any Member of this House thinks it unfair, Mr. Speaker, or has any doubt whatever about the propriety of it, certainly I would not request it.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not say it would be unfair, but it is not a proper request. Everybody else who desires to publish an extension of remarks goes into the back of the RECORD, as the Speaker stated.

Mr. FOWLER. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I shall not make that request if any gentleman objects.

The SPEAKER. It was never a formal rule, but it was a matter of common consent. The reason that agreement was entered into was that if a debate was going on and A would make a remark and B would make a remark in answer to it and then get leave to extend his remarks and put in his speech, sometimes covering five or six pages, anybody trying to find out what really happened in the House that day would be considerably muddled in regard to it. That was the reason for the agreement. It was a gentleman's agreement.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, in order that the House may not misunderstand me, I desire in my remarks to extend a letter from Secretary of the Interior Fisher in 1911, during the pendency of the Sherwood pension bill in the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman make that request?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes. If the Speaker thinks I do not have that authority already, I desire to make the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a perfect right to print the letter. The Chair was referring to that part of the gentleman's request to print his speech after the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. FOWLER. I do not make that request.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to do so, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the rules governing the publication of the RECORD, which he will find contained in the back of the RECORD itself. The seventh rule provides—

The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the speeches withheld for revision.

Mr. FOWLER. Of course, it could be done with unanimous consent. I knew that.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] delivered quite a lengthy speech to-day reviewing legislation in the past for pensions to the soldiers and sailors, their widows and minor and helpless children, in this country, the burden of which was intended to convey the idea that the Republican Party always has been and still is the friend of the soldier and sailor, and wedded to a uniform policy of the most liberal pensions for them, and that, on the contrary, the Democratic Party always has been, and still is, the enemy of the soldier and sailor, and committed to a uniform policy of opposition to liberal pensions for them, their widows and helpless and minor children. Had he gone no further than to extol the constancy of his party to the defenders of our national honor, and to a liberal support for pensions for them and those dependent upon them, I should not have engaged in this controversy at all; but when he charges that the Democratic Party is the enemy of these honorable men, and opposed to granting liberal pensions to them and their widows and children, then I think, in justice to all concerned, a reply should be made, so that the real friend to the soldier and liberal pensions for him and his dependents should be made known.

I desire to place in the RECORD some of the laws which were passed by a Democratic House and approved by a Democratic President.

I am indebted to Representative ADAIR, of Indiana, for assembling a large part of the following acts:

First. Act of August 15, 1876, providing for the issuance of artificial limbs, or commutation therefor, to disabled soldiers and seamen, and providing transportation for the purpose of having the same properly fitted.

Second. Act of February 28, 1877, increasing the pension of those who lost both an arm and a leg.

Third. An act of March 9, 1878, granting pensions on account of service in the War of 1812 and the Revolutionary War, requiring a service of but 14 instead of 60 days on the part of the survivors of the War of 1812, and granting pensions to widows, regardless of the date of the marriage to the soldiers of this war. It also granted pensions to widows of soldiers of the Revolutionary War on a service of 14 days. Former laws required a marriage prior to the treaty of peace in the case of widows of the War of 1812.

Fourth. Act of June 17, 1878, increasing to \$72 per month the pensions of those who lost both hands, both feet, or the sight of both eyes incident to the service.

Fifth. Act of March 3, 1879, increasing to \$37.50 all pensions on account of amputation at the hip joint. This sum was afterwards increased to \$45 per month by a Democratic House.

Sixth. Acts of January 25 and March 3, 1879, granting arrears of pensions from the date of discharge, generous measures which benefited more than 225,000 pensioners at once and caused the annual pension rate to leap from \$33,708,526.19 to \$57,240,540.14. The Republican Party had control of both Houses of Congress for more than 10 years after the close of the war, but passed no legislation of this character.

Seventh. Act of June 21, 1879, abolishing biennial medical examinations and providing that in no case shall a pension be withdrawn or reduced except upon notice to the pensioner and a hearing upon sworn testimony.

Eighth. Act of June 16, 1880, giving \$72 per month to all those who became totally helpless for any cause incident to the service.

Ninth. Act of February 26, 1881, for the protection of pensioners in the soldiers' homes.

Tenth. Act of July 4, 1884, which established the proper relation which should exist between attorneys and clients and fixed by law the fees to be allowed in pension cases. By this act a Democratic Congress placed the strong arm of the law between the helpless applicant and the rapacious agent.

Eleventh. Act of July 14, 1892, establishing an intermediate rate of pensions between \$30 and \$72 per month, and fixing the rate of \$50 for all who required frequent and periodical though not regular and constant personal aid and attention.

Twelfth. Act of August 5, 1892, granting pensions to Army nurses and forbidding the demanding of a fee by claim agents for prosecuting this class of cases. This was a generous recognition of the noble heroines who, leaving home and loved ones behind, in self-sacrifice braved pestilence and hardship to minister to the sick in the hospitals of the Army.

Thirteenth. Act of December 21, 1893, making a pension a vested right.

Here are some other contributions to the pension laws which were either approved by a Democratic President or passed by a Democratic House of Representatives:

Fourteenth. Act of April 18, 1884, making it a felony for any person to falsely or fraudulently represent himself to be an officer of the United States.

Fifteenth. Act of March 19, 1886, increasing from \$8 to \$12 per month the pensions of 79,989 widows and dependents on the roll at the time as well as tens of thousands who have since been placed thereon. These certificates were issued by a Democratic Commissioner of Pensions, without any expense or unnecessary delay to those deserving beneficiaries.

Sixteenth. Act of May 17, 1886, amending the reports of the War Department, which discriminated against a large and worthy class of soldiers, relieving thousands of unfortunate veterans of the hardships worked by the resting of the charges against them, based upon technical errors in the records.

Seventeenth. Act of August 4, 1886, increasing the pensions of 10,030 cripples—armless and legless veterans.

Eighteenth. Act of January 29, 1887, benefiting about 30,000 survivors and widows of the Mexican War.

Nineteenth. Act of June 7, 1888, granting arrears to widows from the date of the death of the husband, and providing that all United States officials authorized to administer oaths should administer all oaths required to be made in pension cases in the execution of vouchers for pensions free of charge. This arrearage act benefited at once more than 200,000 soldiers' widows.

Twentieth. Act of August 27, 1888, increasing pensions on account of deafness.

Twenty-first. Act of February 12, 1889, granting an increase of pension from \$72 to \$100 per month to all persons who lost both hands in the service and line of duty.

Twenty-second. Act of March 1, 1889, relating to the payment of pensions to widows or dependent heirs where subsequent to the issue of the check the pensioner dies.

Twenty-third. Act of March 2, 1889, removing certain technical charges in the record and relieving a large and meritorious class of soldiers.

Twenty-fourth. Act of March 2, 1895, which abolished the rate of \$2 and \$4 and fixed the lowest rate of pension at \$6 per month.

Twenty-fifth. Act of May 11, 1912, granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War, increasing the pension of more than 400,000 soldiers, and which is the best pension law ever enacted by Congress, thereby increasing the annual pension roll from \$153,686,500 to \$180,240,145.84.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a magnificent showing for a party which has been in power only 9 years during the last 54 years. It reveals that the Democratic Party has always had the best interest of the soldiers and seamen at heart. It is true that the Republican Party has been instrumental in the passage of some very good laws for the relief of soldiers, but they have always had within their ranks many bitter enemies to the extension of the pension roll. The money power has always fought such extension, and it must be conceded that this factor has had much to do with the pension policy of Republican administrations of the past. I have some evidence which shows to what length Republican administrations have been controlled by the money power, and I desire to place some of it in the Record.

Mr. Speaker, we are told by the public press than Hon. D. I. Murphy, former Commissioner of Pensions, made the following statement:

During the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic at Philadelphia, one year ago, the pension question and the attitude of this administration—

Meaning President McKinley's administration—toward the Civil War veterans was the principal topic under consideration. A special committee, consisting of R. B. Brown, of Ohio, chairman; John W. Burst, of Illinois; John Palmer, of New York; C. C. Adams, of Massachusetts; and H. B. Case, of Tennessee, had been previously appointed to wait upon the President and protest against the policy being carried out in the Pension Office. This committee called on President McKinley on the morning of September 4, 1899. They presented to him the complaints of their comrades and urged a change in the pension policy. They even went so far as to tell the President that the Grand Army of the Republic might even ask for the removal of the Commissioner of Pensions.

Replying to the committee, the President gave them plainly to understand that he would sustain the commissioner, no matter how strongly the encampment might condemn him, and added this astounding declaration: "There is no use denying the fact, gentlemen, that the money power of the country is against any further expansion of the pension roll." The amazement and discomfiture of the committee were so complete that they quickly withdrew from the Executive presence.

The money power—

Says Mr. Murphy—how does it strike the men who left homes and families and staked their all for the perpetuity of the Government? * * * What has become of that Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, that Washington founded and our veterans fought to preserve?

Mr. Speaker, we are told from a clipping from the Associated Press that Secretary of the Treasury Franklin MacVeagh, in an address at the opening session of the American Academy of Political and Social Science at Philadelphia, on the 7th day of April, 1911, used the following language:

We have a perfectly enormous Civil War pension list, which is not a credit to us. It never had a scientific or just basis, although a worthy motive gave it origin. It has lost its patriotic aspect and has become a political list, costing the Government about \$160,000,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, these clippings tell the true story of disloyalty of the Republican Party to the old soldier in his declining years. The money power furnished the campaign "barrel" for the Republicans, and rather than lose this sweet morsel they decided to dump the old soldiers, their widows, their minor and helpless children, and it was the fights which the Democrats put up in Congress that bore rich fruit for them in the passage of the Sherwood bill. In the Sixty-first Congress, Republican in both Houses and Republican in the White House, with all power over legislation, the Sulloway bill was defeated, and if the Democrats had failed in the elections of 1910 and 1912 I have no doubt but what no new legislation would have been enacted for the relief of the brave men of the sixties. Why try to rob the Democrats of the glory of the passage of the Sherwood bill?

Mr. Speaker, there is record evidence which can not be disputed by anyone, and which will settle the question of loyalty of the Democratic Party to the soldiers and seamen and their dependents. It is a record which Congress has made annually since the Civil War. It is known as the annual appropriation bill for pensions. I invite the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] to this record so that he can compare the appropriations enacted by Republican Congresses with those of Democratic Congresses. When he does this, he will find that during Mr. Cleveland's last administration more money was paid out for pensions than has been paid for that purpose in any administration either before or after his administration, until after the passage of the Sherwood bill. And they will conclusively show that the appropriations for pensions during Mr. Cleveland's administration excel all other administrations in this respect except Mr. Roosevelt's last administration. The appropriations during the three years since the passage of the Sherwood bill falls but little short of the entire appropriations for four years of Mr. Roosevelt's first administration, being only \$420,998.15 short.

It must be admitted that the Sherwood bill as it passed the House was much more liberal than it was after it passed a Republican Senate. Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Fisher, estimated that the increase would reach \$184,000,000 the first year of its operation and \$236,000,000 the second year according to its provisions as it passed the House. But we have seen that the increase fell much short of this sum under the law as it now stands. It was \$180,246,145.84 for the first year and \$180,300,000 for the second year, and for this year it is only \$169,150,000. This reveals that if the bill had become a law as passed by a Democratic House it would have carried an increase of from \$30,000,000 to \$50,000,000, whereas the law as shaped up in a Republican Senate carries an increase of about \$20,000,000, on an average, for the three years. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record the annual appropriations for pensions since 1887, which is as follows:

Total appropriations for 1887	\$76,075,200.00
Total appropriations for 1888 (including all deficiencies)	86,667,500.00
Total appropriation for 1889 (including all deficiencies)	89,758,700.00
Total appropriations for 1890 (including all deficiencies)	107,080,607.35
Total appropriations for 1891 (including all deficiencies)	127,793,059.34
Total appropriations for 1892 (including all deficiencies)	143,189,117.00
Total appropriations for 1893 (including all deficiencies)	160,581,787.35
Total appropriations for 1894	166,531,350.00
Total appropriations for 1895	151,581,570.00
Total appropriations for 1896	141,381,570.00
Total appropriations for 1897	141,328,580.00
Total appropriations for 1898 (including all deficiencies)	149,598,752.46
Total appropriations for 1899 (including all deficiencies)	141,483,830.00
Total appropriations for 1900	145,233,850.00
Total appropriations for 1901	145,245,230.00
Total appropriations for 1902	145,245,230.00
Total appropriations for 1903	139,842,230.00
Total appropriations for 1904 (including all deficiencies)	143,847,600.00
Total appropriations for 1905 (including all deficiencies)	142,860,700.00
Total appropriations for 1906 (including all deficiencies)	141,750,100.00

Total appropriations for 1907 (including all deficiencies)	141,245,500.00
Total appropriations for 1908 (including all deficiencies)	156,143,000.00
Total appropriations for 1909	163,053,000.00
Total appropriations for 1910	160,908,000.00
Total appropriations for 1911 (including all deficiencies)	158,258,000.00
Total appropriations for 1912 (includes \$4,500 in deficiency act for rent of New York agency)	153,686,500.00
Total appropriations for 1913 (including all deficiencies)	180,246,145.84
Total appropriations for 1914	180,100,000.00
Amount in this bill	169,150,000.00

Mr. Speaker, I also insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter which I received from Secretary Fisher during the consideration of the Sherwood pension bill, so that the gentleman from Kentucky can see what a Republican Secretary of the Interior thought of the Sherwood bill, and his opinion as to the increase carried in its provisions. It is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, December 16, 1911.

Hon. P. J. McCUMBER,
Chairman Committee on Pensions,
United States Senate.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your inquiries of the 11th and 13th instant, relative to the cost of the bill H. R. No. 1, entitled "An act granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War and the War with Mexico."

The number of pensioners, together with the length of service, present rate of pension, proposed rate per month, annual increase per pensioner, and total increase per annum, as regards the survivors of the Civil War and the War with Mexico, should the proposed bill be enacted into a law, is as follows:

Length of service.	Number of pensioners.	Present rate per month.	Proposed rate per month.	Annual increase per pensioner.	Total increase per annum.
3 months.....	143	\$6	\$15	\$108	\$15,444
	205	8	15	84	17,220
	185	10	15	60	11,100
	20,422	12	15	36	735,192
	702	14	15	12	8,424
6 months.....	124	6	20	168	20,832
	183	8	20	144	26,352
	165	10	20	120	19,800
	18,234	12	20	96	1,750,464
	627	14	20	72	45,144
	8,255	15	20	60	495,300
	189	16	20	48	9,072
	1,908	17	20	36	68,688
9 months.....	206	6	25	228	46,968
	305	8	25	204	62,220
	275	10	25	180	49,500
	30,391	12	25	156	4,740,996
	1,044	14	25	132	137,808
	13,758	15	25	120	1,650,960
	315	16	25	108	34,020
	3,180	17	25	96	305,280
	8,971	20	25	60	538,260
	182	22	25	36	6,552
	3,893	24	25	12	46,716
1 year and over.....	1,169	6	30	288	336,672
	1,732	8	30	264	457,248
	1,564	10	30	240	375,360
	172,621	12	30	216	37,285,136
	5,932	14	30	192	1,158,944
	78,148	15	30	180	14,066,640
	1,787	16	30	168	300,216
	18,063	17	30	156	2,817,828
	182,351	20	30	120	6,282,120
	1,036	22	30	96	99,456
	22,113	24	30	72	1,592,136
	958	25	30	60	57,480
	471,336				75,651,548

¹Includes 1,393 survivors of the War with Mexico.

The total number who would be entitled to the benefits of the proposed bill, based upon the roll as it existed June 30, 1911, is 471,336. The estimated decrease in this number, due to deaths from July 1, 1911, to January 1, 1912, is about 15,000. The average increase per annum per pensioner is \$160.50. This would cause a reduction in the above estimate, due to deaths, of \$2,407,500, leaving the net increase in the value of the roll \$73,244,048.

The following summary shows the number of pensioners on the roll who would be entitled to the respective rates provided in this bill:

Number.	Rate per month.	Amount per annum.
21,657.....	\$15	\$3,898,290
29,085.....	20	7,124,400
62,520.....	25	18,756,000
351,474.....	30	128,690,640
471,336.....		158,469,300
Deduct \$336.21 x 15,000.....		5,043,150
		153,426,150

Average annual value of each pensioner under this act, \$336.21.

It will be observed that the foregoing estimate does not differ materially from that furnished by the department to the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House of Representatives under date of April 11, 1911. The estimate at that time was based upon a copy of a proposed bill, which did not provide a rate of \$25 per month for those who served nine months and less than one year. The bill as it passed the House makes provision for nine months' service at \$25 per month, and the increased cost due to this provision practically overcomes any reduction which would naturally be expected on account of deaths among the survivors of the Civil War since July 1, 1910.

In the former estimate the pensioners who were receiving less than \$12 per month were omitted because of the small number involved, as were likewise those pensioned at odd rates, such as \$18, \$22, and \$25 per month, for the same reason. However, in order to make this estimate as accurate as possible, it has been thought advisable to include as nearly as practicable all those pensioners on the roll who may have title under this bill. The former estimate did not include the survivors of the War with Mexico, as the bill then under consideration made no provision for that class of pensioners.

The actual cost of the bill for the first year after its passage would depend upon the number of certificates issued. If 200,000 should be issued within the first year, the increase in the disbursements for pension would reach approximately \$32,100,000 and make the total expenditures for pensions amount to about \$184,000,000 for the first year. The maximum cost of this bill would occur in the second year after its enactment, provided the Bureau of Pensions would be able to settle all claims filed under the act in that time. The claims allowed the second year would carry on an average about one year's arrears—the increased rate commencing from the date of filing the application in the Bureau of Pensions. The cost for the second year after the enactment of the bill would very largely exceed that of the first year, being about \$87,000,000, which would make necessary a total appropriation for pensions for that year of probably \$236,000,000. However, the estimates for the third year would show a marked decrease as the arrears carried by the claims adjudicated the second year would no longer appear as a factor. This, in connection with the death rate, would cause a probable reduction in the disbursements for the third year of \$30,000,000.

In the estimated cost of this bill the death rate for the first, second, and third years has been fully taken into consideration.

The enactment of this bill into a law would not, by implication, repeal any existing law or cause a reduction in the rate of any pensioner.

In regard to section 2, you are advised that under the act of March 3, 1883, any person who is so disabled by reason of any wound or injury received or disease contracted while in the military or naval service of the United States and in line of duty as to be incapacitated for performing any manual labor, is entitled to a pension of \$30 per month, while under section 2 of H. R. 1 any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and received an honorable discharge, and who was wounded in battle or line of duty and is now unfit for manual labor, through causes not due to his own vicious habits, or who, from disease or other causes, incurred in line of duty, resulting in his disability is now unable to perform manual labor, would be entitled to a pension of \$30 per month.

It is a very difficult matter to give any accurate estimate as to the increased cost which would result from the second section of this bill, in view of the fact that each person entitled to the \$30 rate thereunder must have been wounded in battle or line of duty or must have been disabled from some disease or other cause incurred in the line of duty, and be unfit for or unable to perform manual labor. It is not believed, however, that the number of beneficiaries under this section would exceed 15,000. The increase in the disbursements due to this section would probably, therefore, not exceed \$2,500,000 per annum. Before the allowance of a claim under this section it would be necessary to have the applicant examined by an examining surgeon or a board of examining surgeons, and the increased cost due to such medical examinations would probably reach about \$200,000 per annum.

Very respectfully,

WALTER L. FISHER, Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, December 29, 1911.

Hon. H. ROBERT FOWLER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: In response to your request of December 26, 1911, I have the honor to inclose herewith a copy of a communication addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, United States Senate, under date of December 16, 1911, relative to the cost of the bill (H. R. 1) entitled "An act granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War and the War with Mexico."

Very respectfully,

WALTER L. FISHER, Secretary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 12291. An act to increase the limit of cost for the extension, remodeling, and improvement of the Pensacola (Fla.) post office and courthouse, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13770. An act to consolidate certain forest lands in the Sierra National Forest and Yosemite National Park, Cal.; and H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution designating the second Sunday in May as Mothers' Day, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, May 9, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. THACHER, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14950) to authorize the city of Louisville, Ky., to open a parkway through the United States fish station and hatchery in Jefferson County, Ky., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 645), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. COADY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12844) for the relief of Spencer Roberts, a member of the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 642), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 262) authorizing the President to detail Lieut. Frederick Mears to service in connection with the proposed Alaskan railroad, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 643), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 236) to authorize the appointment of Clifford H. Tate as a cadet in the United States Military Academy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 644), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 16390) to regulate the hours of labor in continuous working plants of the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 16391) to provide for the purchase of a site for customhouse at Galveston, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 16392) to better regulate the serving of licensed officers in the merchant marine of the United States and to promote safety at sea; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 16393) to repair, re-cover, and otherwise improve the public building at New Orleans, La., known as the customhouse; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 16412) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, to sell and convey a certain tract of land to the Mardian Town and Country Club; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 264) authorizing the President to accept an invitation to participate in the Sixth International Congress of Chambers of Commerce and Commercial and Industrial Associations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 507) providing for the consideration of H. R. 15503; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 508) providing for the consideration of H. R. 13067; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARNHART: Resolution (H. Res. 510) that the bill (H. R. 15902) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications shall be held and recognized as privileged at evening sessions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Resolution (H. Res. 511) authorizing the printing of 500 copies of volumes 1, 2, and 3 of the Proceedings of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the investigation of shipping combinations; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 16394) granting a pension to Martha Hutchings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16395) granting a pension to Maranda Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 16396) granting a pension to John H. Mathews; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EAGLE: A bill (H. R. 16397) for the relief of S. Arni; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 16398) granting a pension to Frances L. Skillings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16399) granting an increase of pension to Edgar L. Newell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 16400) granting an increase of pension to Walter Haldeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 16401) granting a pension to Walter E. Swett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 16402) granting an increase of pension to Abner R. Bradney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 16403) for the relief of Thomas T. Rideout; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 16404) for the relief of Fanny A. Crocker; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16405) for the relief of Samuel Deschamps; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 16406) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Lankford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 16407) granting a pension to Louis L. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 16408) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Hutchinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 16409) granting an increase of pension to Reuel A. Hollis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 16410) for the relief of George A. Tarbox; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 16411) for the relief of F. D. Bain; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Socialist Party of the District of Columbia, relative to mining troubles in Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request) memorial of sundry citizens of New York City; New Castle, Pa.; Cloquet, Minn.; McKean, Pa.; Marietta, Ohio; and Verona, Pa., protesting against the practice of polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AINEY: Petition of 51 citizens of Warren Center, Pa., and 68 citizens of Laceyville, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Association and the Erie Foundrymen's Association, of Erie, Pa., protesting against passage of measures intended to regulate the conduct of interstate business, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Napoleon, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of C. C. Hayden and 30 other members of the Methodist Young People's Society of Wooster, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Edward H. Everett Co., of Newark, Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Petitions of Aaron Bechtel, J. B. Grace, Joseph R. Mock, D. R. Stayer, M. F. Myers, S. B. Finkle, W. S. Schooley, L. W. Koontz, C. E. Miller, Frank Hoover, H. B. Hoffman, F. B. Hetrick, Chalmers Bechtel, T. M. Meyers, J. B. Myers, J. N. Byers, C. W. Bulger, I. H. Bulger, J. G. Kuch-

baum, D. N. Byers, George Y. Replogle, Amos Johnson, Irvin Stayer, M. D., C. B. Hetrick, J. T. Hetrick, C. R. Streamer, J. N. Smith, William Henry, Jr., R. R. Stayer, Hiram Feltan, all of Woodbury, Pa., for passage of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, (by request), petitions of Jacob D. Brown, Samuel Keagy, Jacob Detwiler, Adam Guyer, E. H. Wyles, George E. Croft, C. C. Ritter, D. J. Reininger, A. C. Negley, J. C. Kensinger, C. E. Little, H. H. Baker, A. B. Hoffman, G. W. Mertzner, Charles Miller, Luther Johnson, L. A. Croft, J. W. Reininger, Herman Clouse, John Ullery, all of Maria, Pa., for the passage of House joint resolution 168 relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Chapter No. 721, Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring literacy test in immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Erie, Pa., relative to antitrust legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of the second congressional district of New Jersey against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petitions of the Ninth United Presbyterian Church, the Chartiers United Presbyterian Church, the Eleventh United Presbyterian Church, the Mount Washington United Presbyterian Church, all of Pittsburgh, Pa.; the United Presbyterian Churches of Woodville, Crafton Heights, Rennerdale, Ingram, Carnegie, and Oakdale; the First Baptist Church and sundry citizens of Homestead, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petitions signed by 102 voters of Ozaukee County, Wis., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 50 and 88 and all similar prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the Socialists of Byron County, Okla., protesting against war with Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of a large number of citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Manitowoc Malting Co. and sundry citizens of Manitowoc, Wis., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, of Milwaukee, Wis., against Johnson amendment to Federal pure-food law (H. R. 9418); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COVINGTON: Petitions of sundry citizens of Rock Hill, 15 citizens of Chestertown, 80 citizens of Crisfield, and 33 citizens of Talbot County, all in the State of Maryland, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the Sonoma Wine & Brandy Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., and the Manufacturers and Dealers' League of New York City and State, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEITRICK: Petition of Oscar II Lodge, No. 81, Order of Vasa, of Cambridge, Mass., favoring erection of memorial to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of sundry citizens and voters of the State of Massachusetts, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, approving position taken by the President relative to Mexican conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of 966 citizens of Emporia, Kans., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of Kansas, favoring passage of House bill 11755, relative to Bureau of Farm Loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of the Italian Liquor Dealers' Association, of Ellison, N. J.; the Retail Liquor Dealers' Association; the German Retail Liquor Association of New Jersey; the S. J. Asbell Co., of Paterson, N. J.; and sundry citizens of the seventh congressional district of New Jersey, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGLE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Houston, Tex., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Petition of George Staehle, of Philadelphia, and other citizens, protesting against the prohibition amendments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Racine (Wis.) Suffrage Association favoring equal suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various members of the University Club of Racine, sundry citizens of Baraboo and La Crosse, all in the State of Wisconsin, relative to franchise for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Petition of 25 citizens of Springwood, Va., and 140 citizens of Eagle Rock, Va., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of sundry citizens of Beverly, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Massachusetts Board of Trade against House bill 13492 to prohibit the labeling of any goods with any other name than that of the actual manufacturer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Massachusetts Board of Trade favoring House bill 12292, the Federal child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Young Men's Literary Society of Tacoma Park, D. C., favoring immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of the Massachusetts Liquor League and sundry citizens of Massachusetts, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLET: Petitions of various churches representing 280 citizens of Springfield, 90 citizens of Deerfield, 40 citizens of Amherst, 25 citizens of Whately, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 850 citizens of the second congressional district of Massachusetts, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 169 citizens of the second congressional district of Massachusetts, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 400 citizens of Springfield, Mass., and 35 citizens of Warwick, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of Local No. 914, Machinists' Helpers, of Hyde Park, Mass., relative to strike conditions in Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, against House bill 13492, the Rogers misbranding bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, favoring House bill 12292, the Federal child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petitions of sundry citizens of the eighth congressional district of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of the Union Fishermen's Cooperative Packing Co., of Astoria, Oreg., relative to House bill 12292, to regulate employment of children; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HINDS: Petition of the Maine annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Portland, various voters of Lebanon, the Methodist Episcopal Church of West Scarborough, 200 citizens of Wilton, and 100 citizens of Montswey, all in the State of Maine, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Petitions of sundry citizens of Rockford, Ill., and Local Unions Nos. 11 and 37, United Mine Workers of America, in Coal City, Ill., relative to strike conditions in Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina: Papers to accompany House bill 16333, granting a pension to Joanna C. Roper; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEISTER: Petition of sundry citizens of Westmoreland County, Pa., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the United Presbyterian Church of Fairview, Pa., representing 129 persons, and the Salem Methodist Episco-

pal Church, of Pine Township, Allegheny County, Pa., representing 60 persons, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens and the Men's Bible Class of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Scottsdale, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of 650 citizens of the third congressional district of Rhode Island against national prohibition; to the committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Burrillville, R. I., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Petition of sundry citizens of Essex County, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: Petition of the First Brethren Church, Men's Bible Class of the First Christian Church, Men's Bible Class of Hagerstown, the Christ Worship Society of the Church of Brethren, the Senior Men's Bible Class of the Church of Brethren, the Sunday School of the Church of Brethren, the Young Men's Bible Class of Hagerstown, and sundry citizens of Hagerstown, all in the State of Maryland, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Young Men's Bible Class of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Eckhart; sundry citizens of Eckhart mines, Garrett County, and Selbysport; the Epworth League of Selbysport; the Methodist Episcopal Church of Carlos; and the Epworth League of Friendsville, all in the State of Maryland, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Erie, Pa., against antitrust legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of Chester, Pa., against Government ownership of public utilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petition of sundry citizens of Plevna, Mo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Polo, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Memorial of the Nebraska Church Federation, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANAHAN: Petitions of churches representing 191 citizens of Madella, 50 citizens of Hinckley, 55 citizens of Lafayette, 115 citizens of Fairmont, 75 citizens of Adrian, 125 citizens of Beaver Creek, 115 citizens of Lake Crystal, 50 citizens of Minneapolis, 75 citizens of Hills, all in the State of Minnesota, and the First District Lodge of the Scandinavian Independent Order of Good Templars, with a membership of 1,200, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of sundry citizens of Byron, Kent County, Mich., protesting against the Sabbath-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the fifth congressional district of Michigan, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Byron, Kent County, Mich., favoring passage of House bill 12928, retaining section 6; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of the directors of the Deadwood Business Club, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 25 citizens of Oelrichs, 15 citizens of Edgemont, 336 citizens of Hot Springs, and 25 citizens of Caste, all in the State of South Dakota, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of sundry citizens of Madrid, Burke, Gouverneur, Plattsburg, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Richville, all in the State of New York, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL: Petition of sundry citizens and voters of the State of Massachusetts, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 106 citizens of Natick, Mass., and 300 citizens of Waltham, Mass., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 476 citizens of Marlboro, Mass., and 92 citizens of Framingham, Mass., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Dodgeville, Wis., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Protest of the associate membership of the Knights of the Royal Arch, of San Francisco, Cal., representing the wholesale liquor, brewing, wine, and allied industries, against the Hobson nation-wide prohibition resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of Max I. Koshland and 46 other members of the Grain Trades' Association of California, against the passage of the Hobson nation-wide prohibition resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of the executive committee, representing 52 importers and wholesale liquor merchants of San Francisco, Cal., against the passage of the Hobson nation-wide prohibition resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of the German-American League of California, representing 30,000 voters, against the Hobson nation-wide prohibition resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petitions of sundry citizens of the ninth congressional district of New York, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'LEARY: Petition of various voters of the second congressional district of New York, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petitions of 650 citizens of Rhode Island, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Providence, R. I., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Petitions of various business men of Palmer, Winchendon, South Ashburnham, Gardner, Baldwinsville, Athol, Orange, Southbridge, and Gilbertville, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED: Petitions of Alfred F. Howard and 998 others, of Portsmouth; W. L. Gibson, of Rye; E. S. Johnson, of Greenland; O. B. Marvin, of New Castle; W. Downing, of Greenland; W. W. Day and J. Regan, of Exeter; W. I. Haywood, of New Castle; T. M. Weeks, of Greenland; T. W. Weeks, of Greenland; Louis P. Ladd, of Epping; S. L. Reed, of New Castle; John D. Martson, of Rye; W. C. Hansom, of Dover; H. W. Sheppee, of Manchester; Everett Stark, Edward O. Rouke, and George Mansfield, of Newington; R. Grimes, of Dover; Wallace S. Goss, of Rye; W. R. Weeks, of Greenland; J. W. Ernest, of New Castle; E. E. Sterling, of Rye; Fred W. Ray, Jr., of Rye; Charles W. Neal, of New Castle; K. J. Grimes, of Greenland; E. H. Drake, of Rye; Fred L. Morang, of Dover; O. O. Butterfield and John S. Kimball, of Dover; George Meloon, of New Castle; Fred Hudson, of Gonic; D. E. Sullivan, of Dover; F. M. Pickering, C. P. Yeaton, of Dover; C. C. Johnson, J. N. Libbey, J. Manscom, and G. W. Brackett, of Rye; D. Spinney, of Epping; J. N. Tarlton, of Rye; James Blinn, of New Castle; F. P. Towle and William Brewitt, of Hampton; J. Traversy, E. E. Sterling, F. L. Smart, and W. O. Jennis, of Rye; E. E. Chick, of Rye; Winthrop P. Hoyt and 16 others, of Greenland; all in the State of New Hampshire; also George E. Frany, W. C. Chick, and A. Whitham, of Kittery, Me.; Arthur R. Cason, of Sanford, Me.; and D. F. Fanagan, of Lawrence, Mass.; opposing national prohibition of liquor traffic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of 107 citizens of the third congressional district of New Jersey, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry voters of the third congressional district of New Jersey, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of 252 citizens of Matawan, 35 citizens of Dunellen, 30 citizens of Freehold, 500 citizens of Highlands, and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Lakehurst, all in the State of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Newark (N. J.) Photo-Engravers' Union favoring the passage of the Bartlett-Bacon bill (H. R. 1873); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHREVE: Petition of 4,100 voters of the twenty-fifth congressional district of Pennsylvania, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of the Congregational Church and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of New Plymouth, Idaho, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petitions of the Christian Endeavor Society of Longmont, Colo., and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Fruita, Colo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of various business men of Greenfield, Shelburne Falls, Charlemont, and Ayre, all in the State of Massa-

chusetts, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THACHER: Memorial of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, protesting against House bill 13492—Rogers misbranding bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Petition of sundry citizens of Rahway, N. J., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Rockaway and Cranford, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of Charlie Eby and Jefferson Swank, both of Findlay, Ohio, protesting against the adoption of House joint resolution 168, relating to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.